

**Savannah River Site
Citizens Advisory Board
Meeting Minutes
July 26-27, 2010
North Augusta, SC**

Monday, July 26 2010: Attendance

SRS CAB Members

Tabitha Barrett
Dr. Emile Bernard
Manuel Bettencourt
Dr. Donald Bridges
Edward Burke
Arthur Domby
Judith Greene-McLeod
Lee Harley-Fitts
Dr. Rose Hayes
Stanley Howard
Dr. Kuppuswamy Jayaraman
Ranowul Jzar
Cleveland Latimore
Denise Long
Madeleine Marshall
Joseph Ortaldo
Dr. Marolyn Parson
Skye Vereen
John Snedeker
Dr. Gerald Wadley
Sarah Watson
Alex Williams
Kathe Golden-*Absent*

Agency Liaisons

Cathy Amoroso, EPA
Al Frazier, GADNR
Karen Guevara, DOE-SR
Heather Cathcart, SCDHEC
Kim Newell, SCDHEC

Regulators

Kyle Bryant, EPA
David Williams, EPA

DOE/OTHER

Jim Folk, DOE-SR
Michael Ellis, DOE-SR
Brenda Mills, DOE-SR
Zack Smith, DOE-SR
Becky Craft, DOE-SR
Gerri Flemming, DOE-SR
Carl Lanigan, DOE-SR
Sonitza Blanco, DOE-SR
Charles Borup, DOE-SR
Jim Windha, US Army
Jonathan English, US Army
Don McLean, US Army

Contractors

Ginger Dickert, SRR
Rachel Hinckley, SRR
Joyce Lindsay, SRR
Steve Wilkerson, SRR
Pete Hill, SRR
Doug Bumgardner, SRR
Josh Streetman, SRNS
Jeff Newman, SRNS
Jeanette Hyatt, SRNS
Sonny Goldston, SRNS
Paul Sauerborn, SRNS
Ray Hicks, SRNS
Eric Nelson, SRNL
Mark Schmitz, SRS
Jenny Freeman, V3
Bill Brizes, V3
Erica Williams, V3

Stakeholders

Tom Clements
Liz Goodson
Murray Riley
Karen Patterson
Charles Hanson
James Harris
Nancy Bobbitt
Tedd Antonacci
Richard Macon
Ken McLeod
Eddie Watson

Ms. Karen Guevara, Department of Energy (DOE), served as the Deputy Designated Federal Official (DDFO). Ms. Jenny Freeman served as Meeting Facilitator.

The Facilitator reviewed the ground rules, agenda and meeting procedures, including a request from the support staff for those commenting to please state their names before speaking.

Strategic and Legacy Management Committee – Dr. Gerald Wadley, Chair

The committee Chair introduced himself and his two Vice Chairs, Madeleine Marshall and Marolyn Parson. He announced that his committee had a meeting on May 11, 2010 and added there is one open recommendation. He said that a letter response from DOE has been received on the open recommendation. DOE accepted the request to increase SRS tours for the public and reservations for tours can now be arranged via telephone. However, they could not agree to extend tours to the weekend and could not offer privatization.

He asked Bill Brizes, CAB Technical Advisor, if the committee had closed all other open recommendations; Mr. Brizes confirmed they had. CAB member Gerald Wadley announced that the next meeting is scheduled for August 18, 2010.

CAB member Wadley brought forward the issue of metrics and invited CAB member Donald Bridges to speak. CAB member Bridges suggested the CAB take a 10-year look to see what has been done, and get a three to four year projection. He suggested this for Site footprint reduction, TRU waste inventory, soil and water remediation, facilities D&D, liquid waste inventory, and DWPF canisters, which are all performance measures they are currently receiving reports on. He said with the 10-year review and subsequent projection, the CAB could review any progress. CAB member Wadley suggested a graphic presentation of all the metrics to “the day that they end” and commented that CAB member Bridges’ suggestion should be a recommendation. CAB member Kuppuswamy Jayaraman replied that any presentation should also include a projection over the next 10 years and CAB member Judith Greene-McLeod added that it would be helpful to see the interface of CAB recommendations interwoven into the presentation to show what effect they’ve had.

CAB member Rose Hayes asked CAB member Bridges how he viewed interfacing in terms of what the CAB hopes to achieve with various recommendations. CAB member Bridges answered that he thinks it will be more useful in determining progress and CAB member Madeleine Marshall interjected that she liked the idea and said it may be what the CAB has been looking for. CAB member Hayes stated that she assumes recommendations that have been put forward and the CAB has responses to, as well as recommendations that are still open, will somehow be interfaced in the performance assessment report. CAB member Bridges answered he wasn’t sure how the CAB would tie every instance, such as cases with the DWFP canisters, to a recommendation, but that in more routine cases such as footprint reduction and TRU waste, the CAB would see a realistic improvement.

Presentation: American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Update- Mr. Zack Smith, DOE-SR

Mr. Smith introduced himself as DOE’s manager for the American Recovery and Reinstatement Act (ARRA) and stated he would talk about what is taking place in the areas of TRU Waste, Heavy Water Component Test Reactor (HWCTR), P Reactor, R Reactor, P&R Ash Basin, as well as the K Cooling Tower. He added that 248 drums of repackaging were completed at F Canyon Drum Operations; since the last CAB meeting, a total of 82 cubic meters have been repackaged and shipped offsite. Mr. Smith emphasized that for the ARRA effort, 1,680 meters cubed has been shipped so far, but 5,000 is the goal. He said it may not sound like that’s where “they need to be”, but asked the CAB to keep in mind that to start up the process there was an abundance of engineering and design work, as well as construction activities and negotiations. The schedule has a completion date listed as the end of 2012.

CAB member Bridges asked what the “bottleneck” is, clarifying that the term pertains to design work and construction. Mr. Smith referred to HWCTR, stating the work is going well and explained some big items to take place in the near future includes the top of HWCTR being cut out in order to get to the reactor

vessel out to dispose of it; oil draining is also taking place.

Mr. Smith commented that in P Reactor, grout Plant operations were initiated, and that these Plants were built on Site for the purpose of servicing primarily P & R. He said it is not currently at full capacity but is supporting all of the activities in P area and will be used more extensively to complete R area. He stated that within the Disassembly Basin, roughly 2.5 million gallons out of 4 million gallons have been evaporated and similar activity is taking place in R Reactor; oil has been removed from equipment. He added they have begun grouting areas to -2 foot elevation.

CAB member Jayaraman asked Mr. Smith how ARRA defines what activities get more emphasis, money and people, since these are presumably ongoing activities. Mr. Smith answered that prior to his return to the Site, funding in the area of D&D had declined before ARRA was considered. He continued that when ARRA was considered, one of the big pushes was “shovel ready activities,” which are defined as activities that can be readily implemented and added that the footprint reduction, or clean-up piece, of the work at this Site met that requirement well and it was pushed heavily at Congress and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to have it approved under the ARRA. He stated that the “big push” for ARRA is the footprint reduction, as well as waste removal from the Site. Mr. Smith said that in the P and R Ash Basins, work is going forward with tree removals and removal of soils from the area, as well as preparing soil to go back over the basins, and that the K-Cooling Tower generates a good deal of interest.

In his summary, Mr. Smith stated that there has been major progress with ARRA and they are working to move waste faster and more safely. He added that they have been working with the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) and referred to a prior CAB meeting where discussion was had about the “TRU Pack 3.” He explained that “TRU Pack 3” has many advantages and that one “TRU Pack 3” will come onsite by June of 2011, with one being provided each month until the Site has a total of six. He added that these are “fully approved.” In terms of footprint reduction, progress is being made with 50 square miles out of 240 for the ARRA effort.

CAB member Marshall asked Mr. Smith how much money was being spent, where ARRA is in respect to the spend plan, and if it is going to finish on time and spend all funds. This was a previous concern for the CAB.

Mr. Smith answered that when the ARRA was first put into place, it “laid the money out” as best it could and placed funds on certain activities such as P, R, and M Areas, as well as other areas of interest. He stated that funds are currently being redistributed depending on the need per area. More money is being put into Transuranic Waste Removal. He explained that when Transuranic Waste Removal was introduced, roughly 2,000 cubic meters were to be shipped to WIPP from the effort, but now the goal is 5,000 cubic meters. He noted that this increase in cubic meters means more money. Another significant change is internal to the Site; ARRA wants to go after a little more than 200 square miles of footprint reduction. This means more money will be put into footprint reduction. Overall, the money will get distributed differently than it is now to get the required work done as it needs to be done.

After Mr. Smith’s explanation, CAB member Marshall stated that in reference to shifting the budget, there “clearly is the latitude” to do that. Mr. Smith answered that it must go through a reapportionment process that goes all the way through Headquarters and the OMB.

CAB member Jayaraman asked what areas are costing less and Mr. Smith answered that P and R areas are costing less than projected. CAB member Jayaraman asked if that meant these areas are still being allocated sufficient funds and Mr. Smith answered that P and R are still being done, but that it is costing less than originally thought which means more money is available for other more costly areas.

CAB member Greene-McLeod asked, in reference to the P Area Ash Basin and the R Area Ash Basin, if the ash is being removed or covered. Mr. Smith answered the ash is being removed. Karen Guevara (DDFO) answered that she did not believe the ash is being removed. She said that it is a matter of removing the trees from the top and putting the soil cover on top. Mr. Smith clarified that even though he said that P and R areas are less expensive, in R area more removal was required than originally projected so it actually

ended up costing more. CAB member Greene-McLeod asked if Mr. Smith said 200 square miles, and commented that the Site is only a little more than 300 square miles. Mr. Smith said it is 75 percent of the Site and CAB member Greene-McLeod said that she was a little confused by this because much of it wasn't "involved" and nothing needed to be done to it. Mr. Smith explained that there are waste units, and then a whole area will be deemed available for free use. Now those waste sites are declared "clean" and ready for another use. CAB member Greene-McLeod commented that she understands that but the ARRA hasn't actually "done anything to 250 square miles." Mr. Smith answered that they haven't actually taken a bulldozer over 250 square miles, but they've taken waste units over areas such as M area. CAB member Greene-McLeod interjected that in the presentation it is stated in a way that implies there was something done to 250 square miles when really there was only a small amount of the Site that needs to be mediated.

CAB member Ortaldo addressed Mr. Smith by saying that he thinks what CAB member Greene-McLeod is asking is, "Out of the 250 square miles that you're claiming, how much of that needed work and how much of that didn't need work?"

Mr. Smith answered that he needs to bring in a map that has the layout of the waste site units. Ms. Guevara (DDFO) commented that CAB member Greene-McLeod's question has been asked many times. She clarified that Mr. Smith is talking about 75 percent of the full 310 square miles of SRS. She said they talk in terms of area completions and that's what is being talked about in the presentation. Ms. Guevara explained that the physical number of acres is not measured.

CAB member Emile Bernard said that he had a new record of decision that says three P area operable units are done and there will be no more work done to it as they no longer pose a threat to humans or the population. He asked which three. Ms. Guevara offered to find that information.

CAB member Arthur Domby asked a question about the status of the disposition of 200 cubic meters of TRU Waste that was deemed "very difficult waste" at a May CAB meeting. Mr. Smith said it is all within the current plan to address.

Presentation: Citizens Advisory Board Update: U.S. Army Training at SRS- Mr. Don McLean, U.S. Army

Mr. McLean introduced himself as the facility training coordinator at Fort Gordon and said that the Army is proposing to use existing land and some of its facilities for non-live fire training. He stated that tanks or artillery vehicles with tracks will not be used. He said the current missions at SRS via DOE are the primary missions, the Army's training will be secondary, and the Army will coordinate all of its activities around the DOE missions. The proposal for Army training will support the National Defense, security needs, and ongoing missions within the Army.

In response to why the Army chose SRS, he stated that in 2006 the Army was short approximately 2 million acres of training land as a result of the Base Realignment and Closer Program in 2005. Some facilities were closed down and resulted in a loss of training land that the Army cannot get back. They formed an agreement with SRS to utilize available land.

He explained that if the Army comes to SRS, it will treat it like a different country and that the title used within the presentation, "Supreme Republic of Savannistan," was coined to convey that distinction. The units that train at SRS will train as if they are being deployed; the units will provide all supplies except water, trash and port-a-let support.

The first two documents, the Memorandum of Understanding and the Interagency Agreement, were completed as of September 2007 and 2009, respectively. Mr. McLean said these are the "driving documents" for the Environmental Assessment, which is written in draft format and will be up soon for public viewing. He added that the Draft Joint Standard Operating Procedure is also done in draft form and is almost ready for public review. He is currently writing the Biological Evaluation required by the Endangered Species Act and said the Army is a big steward in protecting the environment. The Army also conducted noise modeling for aircraft on and off SRS. He added that Barnwell Airport will be used as a drop zone. After the Army has been training for a year or two, the URS Corporation will come back and

document any damage. The URS Corporation is a leading provider of engineering, construction and technical services for public agencies and private sector companies around the world.

CAB Chair Bettencourt asked if the drop zone was just personnel or if it was also equipment. Mr. McLean answered that it could be equipment. He said that the 700th air lift squadron out of Atlanta has expressed interest in using drop zones other than the ones at Fort Gordon.

CAB member Hayes asked how the noise hazard is measured. Mr. McLean said there is a formula that is used; it can be used as a template over areas that need to be modeled and takes into account species in the area as well as the human population. CAB member Hayes asked if it is measured in decibels. Mr. McLean said it was measured in decibels and offered to send the information to CAB member Hayes.

CAB member Bridges asked if the training was “Army-wide” or was it just Fort Gordon. Mr. McLean confirmed that it was Army-wide. CAB member Bridges then asked how many people would be involved in an exercise. Mr. McLean explained that the largest the Army could go maxes out at 550, but on the opposite spectrum there are the Civil Support Teams, who the National Guard wants to train, that would have a max of 22 soldiers.

Mr. McLean stated that Plant Vogtle is aware that the Army is training at SRS and have asked the Army not to fly over them and to notify Plant Vogtle when it is training in the area. He explained that the Army will use the Three Rivers Landfill to assist in trash disposal and also for pre-inspection of vehicles coming onto Site. He continued there will be no clear-cutting of land for helicopter training as land that has already been cleared will be used as drop zones.

He displayed an image of Barnwell airport to show how the Army would train at that location and the runway that will be used for aircraft training. He added that Fort Bragg wants to send its vehicles by rialto save on vehicle wear and tear. There are no facilities on SRS where they can load a Humvee onto the ground; therefore, the Army went offsite and asked Energy Solutions if it could use its ramp. Railcars will come in through SRS property, be inspected and will go out the back-gate.

As for environmental concerns, Mr. McLean said that the Army is one of the biggest stewards for protecting the environment and troops are trained to protect the animal population at SRS. He said there are hunts, deer capture, deer study, bird study, control birds, wild boar control and coyote study; these are the major issues the Army has to work around while training. He added that these operations are primary and the Army training is secondary. SRS also has timber harvest, which Mr. McLean said the Army supports.

He stated that the Army has people assigned to each installation that build ranges and training facilities. He said they use trailers fabricated into buildings, and had to do an environmental study and get it approved. As for getting soldiers on SRS, he explained that there should be a 90-day coordination and every soldier must receive a safety briefing before coming to SRS and all soldiers will be activated into the Remote Worker Program. Communication will be set up as a “triangle” with Savannah River Site Operations Center (SRSOC), OIC/RSOs and Fort Gordon Range Control. He said that one of his major responsibilities is coordinating with local public, counties and public safety organizations to let them know what they are going to do in terms of training.

CAB member Bernard asked where the aircraft control facilities would be located for aircrafts coming onto the Site. Mr. McLean said that if any aircrafts are coming in they will have to check in with SRSOC in A area. CAB member Bernard asked if they will control the ins and outs of the aircrafts. Mr. McLean confirmed they would and once the aircrafts are out of SRS, they will monitor them through local airports such as Bush Field or Daniel Field, in Augusta, GA.

CAB member Wadley asked about the Army’s time frame for training. Mr. McLean answered that the Army cannot begin training until the Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) and Environmental Assessment is complete; he said they are aiming for the end of October or beginning of November for first training event. CAB member Wadley asked how long the Army would be training at SRS and Mr. McLean answered indefinitely. CAB member Wadley then asked how much fuel the Army would store onsite and

Mr. McLean answered that all fuel would be brought with each individual unit, but added that each unit may be able to request fuel from SRS. Charles Borup, DOE, referred to the question on how long the Army training would go on. He said that Mr. McLean said “indefinitely”; however, there is a clause in the agreement that either side could terminate with a 60-day notice.

CAB member Marolyn Parson asked how many days a year that training would be in process. Mr. McLean said he didn’t have an exact number of dates yet and said he thinks it would be short duration training, such as two weeks at the most. CAB member Parson then asked if there would be additional security measures needed onsite, and if so, who would pay for these measures. Mr. McLean said there should be no additional security measures on Site.

CAB member Marshall asked if soldiers come upon a waste area or an area that ties into historic preservation, will the soldiers be briefed on how to handle that. Mr. McLean said that if soldiers come upon an area with a nuclear symbol they have been trained avoid the area and that they already have a list of archeological sites on SRS. If soldiers find anything of archeological significance, they leave it, report it, and the Army reports to the DOE.

CAB member Greene-McLeod asked if there will be areas on the Site that will be excluded from other remote area workers on the Site while they are in use in Army Training. Mr. McLean said that he hopes the coordination process will take care of this, but acknowledged that there will be specialized units that don’t want to be looked at and the Army is working to co-use the land. Karen Guevara, DDFO, interjected that since SRSOC is involved and works with remote workers, they will coordinate mandatory remote workers that have to come in.

CAB member Greene-McLeod asked Mr. McLean, in reference to the Biological Evaluation, if he is a trained biologist or if he would collaborate. Mr. McLean said he is not a trained biologist, and he is collaborating with the Forest Service and National Office of Animal Health (NOAH), as well as people from the lab for some of the species that are endangered. CAB member Greene-McLeod stated that Par Pond is a huge area for Waterfowl to use over the winter and asked if they are taking into account species other than the endangered species. Mr. McLean said they are not going by any lakes or ponds and ask soldiers to take all wildlife in account. CAB member Greene-McLeod stated that she was referring to overhead aircrafts disturbing the wildlife and Mr. McLean explained that the noise model he referred to earlier took that into account and assessed there would be no negative impact. As for the Bald Eagle, he said they won’t train within 1,800 feet. Karen Patterson Mr. McLean if the Biological Evaluation would, include fish wildlife and nymphs. Mr. McLean said yes.

CAB member Jayaraman said he knows the Army does a good job of protecting the environment so he is not worried about the environmental impact of Army training, but he is worried about the safety of the installation, the fact that there is mobile training and of aircrafts crashing into one of the facilities. Mr. McLean said it would take a blatant disregard for policy for an aircraft to fly over any facilities and said that it’s likely that no one is going to know the Army is out there training as it will be away from the general public.

Tom Clements, Friends of the Earth, stated that under the National Environmental Policy Act, the DOE and other agencies are not required to do a security assessment of proposed action and asked if there are going to be military training actions near the K Reactor. He then asked if there is an analysis the public can see that shows that the Army has looked at interactions with SRS’s existing security measures. He said it could possibly cause a situation that would lower security at K Reactor.

Mr. McLean stated that in terms of “strict paperwork,” there isn’t any, but there have been a significant number of meetings on how to keep the Army separated from Wackenhut and referred to a red buffer area on the map. He explained that Army trainees come in through direct route, don’t have a free roam, and therefore won’t be near K Reactor. Mr. Clements asked if there was an actual security analysis available. Mr. McLean reconfirmed the continued meetings on the subject; he said it is in the Standard Operating Procedures (SOP). Mr. McLean asked Mr. Borup if Mr. Clements could review the SOP.

Mr. Borup stated that the document will go through public review and since the Army is staying out of K Area, it is difficult to document what impact the Army will have on that area. Mr. McLean added that part of the Army's agreement in the SOP with SRS is that they have to conduct public notifications about what they are doing at SRS. Mr. Clements replied that part of the issue is that the Army could potentially cover for an outside force, unknowingly, under the confusion surrounding the Army's interference. He said he doesn't know if that analysis has been done and Mr. McLean said this issue has been addressed. Mr. Borup agreed and said this was addressed by ensuring that everyone who needs to be notified is notified.

CAB member Sarah Watson asked for confirmation that Mr. McLean and Mr. Borup were stating that the Army is self-policing. Mr. McLean said they are self-policing, but the policy they are putting together with DOE addresses how the Army is going to come on SRS, how the public is going to be notified and how they are going to do things safely. Mr. Borup added that in the case of self-policing you have to have the context; in the case of safety, they will follow Army safety procedures but it will all be within the parameters of the DOE's procedure plan.

Facilities Disposition and Site Remediation Committee- Dr. Kuppuswamy Jayaraman, Chair

CAB member Jayaraman gave a brief explanation of what his committee does within the CAB, including its purpose. He introduced the members and said that the committee does not have any pending recommendations or special news. He announced that the next day there would be a presentation about the Heavy Water Components Test Reactor.

CAB Chair Manuel Bettencourt commented that in the Record of Decision (ROD), announced for the P Area operable unit at SRS, there was wording he had never seen. He read aloud the writing in question as, "In the long term, if the property is ever transferred to non federal ownership the deed should include restrictions precluding residential use of the property." He said he wants to know why the wording was switched. CAB member Jayaraman asked the committee members to think about this and if the DOE has any concerns in regards to those statements, they could all discuss it.

Shelly Wilson, SCDHEC, asked CAB Chair Bettencourt if the wording he found odd was in an environmental bulletin or a public notice and stated that language was typical. Karen Guevara, DDFO, agreed with Ms. Wilson but said she would check to make sure. Cathy Amoroso, EPA, commented that the language in question is part of the "layman control remedy" and said maybe it doesn't always go in the bulletins like that, but said they use that language when they have a layman's control remedy. CAB Chair Bettencourt said the language sounds reasonable to him, but his concern was that he had never seen it before in a bulletin. CAB member Ortaldo stated that Bill Lawless used to raise the issue of holding land in perpetuity and federal control and stated that his understanding is that it is a DOE policy now. He said Bill Lawless used to advocate that there should be federal legislation that makes it a matter of law so that it will always be in federal control for perpetuity and that right now he believes it is in a form that makes it possible for the DOE to change its mind if it wants to.

Nuclear Materials Committee- Judith Greene-McLeod, Chair

CAB member Greene-McLeod welcomed everyone and gave a brief explanation of what her committee does within the CAB. She explained there is an overlap between the Nuclear Materials Committee and the Waste Management Committee.

She introduced Vice Chairs Stan Howard and Edward Burke. She announced that the committee has one pending recommendation that they approved at the May meeting in Savannah. This recommendation was to finalize the plan for plutonium disposition. She said that the committee has four open recommendations; Recommendation 250 from November 2007 is ready to be closed with all issues but one being resolved, and that issue was reintroduced in Recommendation 271. She explained that Recommendations 271, 263 and 250 all had to do with plutonium disposition; Pat McGuire is going to present about this at the following day's meeting.

She continued that DOE is supposed to issue a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement to define the

amount of plutonium processing and disposition; a scoping meeting about this topic will be held on August 17, 2010. She stated that Recommendation 259 is waiting for a letter from DOE on Nuclear Materials coordination, and complete safety documentation for H Canyon and HB line. Recommendation 266 is waiting DOE study completion.

She said that at the June meeting, where the Nuclear Materials Committee co-met with the Waste Management Committee, there was a discussion on Bipartite storage summary. CAB member Burke and other members put together a chart that will follow nuclear materials through time, including where it comes from, where it's going and what the disposition should be. In June they also got an update on the Nuclear Material Systems Plan. At the May meeting, there was an update on the depleted uranium oxide disposition status of heavy water and an essay project overview.

CAB member Greene-McLeod introduced CAB member Hayes to talk about Recommendation 263, which is shared with the Waste Management Committee. CAB member Hayes said that more than a year ago, Recommendation 263 was brought before the CAB and sent to the DOE. She explained that it was a six-part recommendation and the response received only partially answered the recommendations. One issue in the recommendation concerns the disposition of plutonium uranium high-level waste from SRS and from South Carolina. She said there have been many CAB discussions on public law 107107 Section 31-53, which provides for the removal of such materials from SRS and SC. She said in reviewing the report it did not address the issue of when and how these materials would be dispositioned from SRS and South Carolina. CAB member Hayes continued that as of late it has become a political decision rather than a scientific decision to shut down Yucca Mountain as the designated National Repository Site and it seems practical at this point to modify Recommendation 263. She said that rather than ask for a date when the materials will be dispositioned, the recommendation should advise that the application for license at Yucca Mountain continue, and procedures for making it a National Repository continue, so it is available for that function until the Blue Ribbon Panel can come to a decision on alternatives.

CAB Chair Bettencourt said this should be a new recommendation and that judges recently ruled that DOE does not have the authority to quit licensing Yucca Mountain, and has to continue on. Karen Patterson commented that Atomic Safety Licensing Board (ASLB) Panel said that they didn't think that the DOE had the right to withdraw, but it's the Commission's decision and they have not yet ruled. CAB member Burke said that he would support continuing Yucca Mountain, and does not oppose the recommendation, but that the issue here is the CAB is suggesting they continue working on a Site that they intend to discontinue before its put in service, which means the CAB is asking DOE to spend money on something they are intending to shut down. He added that the CAB needs to look in terms of what they can recommend, but the CAB is in a bad situation to make a firm recommendation and explained that the CAB needs to clearly think out what the ramifications will be of any recommendation.

CAB Facilitator, Jenny Freeman, asked CAB member Greene-McLeod when the Nuclear Materials Committee will be holding its next meeting; the answer was August 24. Ms. Freeman confirmed that the recommendation in question would be discussed at that meeting.

CAB member Joseph Ortaldo commented that he agrees with what CAB member Hayes is trying to do, but thinks the recommendation should be in more general terms of focusing primarily on the need to have a federal repository as soon as possible. He said the CAB needs to keep the recommendation within that scope. CAB member Dombey commented that a recommendation focused on Yucca Mountain is out of the CAB's charter, but countered that within its charter is clearly the disposal of waste. He said there are areas where the CAB can legitimately focus on plutonium disposition within its charter. He referenced H Canyon operation and the increased loading of plutonium in the Vitrification Facility. He applauded CAB member Hayes' research of public law 107-107 because there are some things he doesn't think DOE is doing and explained that the law says "consultation required" in the first section; he said the CAB should reinforce that DOE hold the required consultation. He commented that he thinks the CAB could be a forum where DOE and the state of South Carolina could engage in discussion.

CAB member Hayes commented that the CAB's mission statement is "painted with a very large brush," and that while she has heard before that the Yucca Mountain issue is out of the CAB's scope, with the

mission statement's wording in mind she doesn't see it as an issue. She then referred to public law 107-107, Section 31.53, saying it gives a definite date in which the materials have to leave South Carolina and that has come and gone. She said it is specific to South Carolina, but the response they got neglected to address this and she believes it is in the scope of the CAB to look at Yucca Mountain. CAB member Jayaraman said that he does not agree that Yucca Mountain is outside the scope of the CAB. He continued that the ultimate storage of the waste is going to define the entire modus operandi of how SRS is dealing with waste and that the issue of Yucca Mountain is the CAB and SRS's scope. CAB Chair Bettencourt said that he doesn't believe the issue is out of the scope of the CAB to comment on how the studies that have gone into Yucca Mountain need to be preserved and that the current situation or plan is to just stop and let it expire. CAB member Greene-McLeod agreed that it would be foolish to waste all the information and not deal with it or archive it for when another administration takes over.

CAB member Greene-McLeod closed Recommendation 250, and stated that Pat McGuire, DOE, would be presenting the next day.

Waste Management Committee- Joseph Ortaldo, Chair

CAB member Ortaldo gave a brief explanation of what his committee does within the CAB and introduced two Co-Chairs, Arthur Domby and Alex Williams, and committee members.

He noted that they had an interesting meeting with the Government Accountability Office (GAO). He explained that the GAO has two study groups that are looking at the effects of Yucca Mountain; the group that talked to CAB was assigned to look at the impact on Federal Government Defense Waste and another team was looking at the commercial world and spent fuel. He commented that the point of the meeting was to see what the impact of the CABs on all sites and they focused on cost. The biggest interest for the CAB members centered on the issues surrounding Yucca Mountain and why Yucca Mountain can't be used.

CAB member Edward Burke stated that the GAO started the conversation with a much more political approach than he expected. He said the office, prior to meeting the CAB, had met with Site officials and considered the CAB as more of a community organization representing the feelings and emotions of the community. He said they were asking questions such as, "What would it take to make this more of a hot button issue in the community?" and "Do you foresee this being raised as a political issue?" He added that the CAB pressed them to give a technical answer to why the decision was made and the office answered with "If we gave you an answer as to why the decision was made and that decision was political, rather than technical, would that be acceptable?" He explained he was surprised by the tone of the meeting; the office was clearly trying to get input from the community on the political impact of the decision. CAB member Ortaldo clarified for those unfamiliar with the office that the Government Accountability Office performs studies that are almost always sponsored by members of Congress or committees of Congress.

CAB member Ortaldo said there was an open meeting with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) on July 13 and 14 in Aiken. He said it was aimed at tank closure and waste determination. He asked at the meeting's public comment section "Why is it taking so long?" and "Where are you in defining how clean a tank needs to be to close?" CAB member Hayes stated that the NRC made the comment several times that they were sorry if attendees got the idea that it was a public meeting and that they would have one later and that it seemed like they were surprised of the CAB member's presence. CAB member Ortaldo said that he didn't get the impression that NRC was surprised and he thinks what they meant by their comments was that the meeting was not a typical NRC public hearing. CAB member Hayes asked if CAB member Ortaldo thought that the NRC was surprised because they were expecting something from the CAB that they didn't get. CAB member Ortaldo said he didn't think so and asked NRC members to comment.

Greg Suber, NRC, commented that the clarification the project manager was making at the NRC meeting was that it was a technical meeting and that sometimes they have meetings where they break things down for the public. According to Mr. Suber, the project manager was trying to be clear to those present from the public that the language would be technical, not because NRC was trying to be evasive, but because it was a working group meeting of technical people coming together to discuss technical issues. CAB member Hayes said that she thought the NRC thought that the CAB had misunderstood and that the CAB was

supposed to have all committee heads there with input to add. Mr. Suber restated that the project manager was just trying to be sensitive to non-technical people. CAB member Hayes said that perhaps in the future the NRC could have a meeting where it could solicit information from the CAB since many have technical backgrounds and that more members of the CAB would have attended if they knew it was a technical meeting. Mr. Suber said this information was good for him to know and that the NRC is trying to be clear and transparent; the NRC would be open to such a meeting.

Ginger Dickert, SRR, commented that in her presentation on July 27 she would highlight the closure documentation meeting that CAB member Ortaldo was talking about on waste determination, all the opportunities the CAB is going to have for involvement, and try to distinguish between the two types of meetings. She stated that she thinks they are both valuable, and interesting, opportunities to provide input and added that to some extent it's because the CAB has indicated so much interest that DOE has opened working sessions. She said she would give information on all these meetings and times.

CAB member Domby commented that on May 18 there was a risk assessment and work assessment working session the NRC, with the DOE, hosted for public in general that directly related to the closure of the tanks and the releases from the tanks as modeled by DOE. He said he takes CAB member Hayes' comment as a desire for more information and communication and asked NRC members to take back with them the appreciation of the CAB and its desire to have more communication and open meetings.

CAB member Jayaraman commented that the NRC was one of the best meetings he's attended during his time on the CAB and that it was a good learning session.

CAB member Ortaldo continued that his committee had a meeting on June 22 with the two topics presented being related to the top 10 Programmatic Risks of the Rev. 15 System Plan. He said this is a very key document and that one of the subjects was the 10 highest programmatic risks associated with this document; the other topic was a job initiative training program. He said that there were two pending, two joint open recommendations (264 and 263), and eight open recommendations. He asked CAB members to come to the August committee meeting with suggestions on how to close those open recommendations.

CAB member Parson asked if the GAO meeting and report would be ready in February. CAB member Ortaldo said yes and CAB member Parson asked DOE to let the CAB know when it is ready. Ms. Guevara agreed. CAB member Parson explained that the report will make recommendations to answer specific questions that the Congress asked and the agency that is the subject of that, such as DOE, will have the opportunity to comment on those. She said it is very interesting to see the agency's reaction to the GAO report.

Presentation: *The Top Ten Programmatic Risks of the Rev. 15 System Plan -Doug Bumgardner, Savannah River Remediation (SRR)*

Mr. Bumgardner introduced himself as the manager of System Planning at SRR and began his presentation by clarifying what he meant by programmatic risk. He explained that oftentimes when one thinks about a risk, he or she thinks about a hazard, but that the risks he is listing are not hazards. He stated that the programmatic risks are the issues that would take up more time or cost more than anticipated.

He continued that his risk management process is consistent to what you would typically do with project management and that the risks covered today cover the entire life cycle of liquid waste. Multiple areas are covered such as business, technical, and programmatic; he noted that risks change over the life of project. He said that his program evaluates risks on a real-time basis and that each year they do an update of the system plan and reevaluates the risks; the current risk management plan covers Rev. 15. He explained that when you judge risk there are criteria to follow in order to formally grade how much of a risk it is and that typically the risks relate to how long that particular event could delay the program; time and money factor into the risk assessment.

CAB member Bridges asked Mr. Bumgardner to go over the likelihood criteria. Mr. Bumgardner gave an example of likelihood example as "I have an event that occurs less than 10 years, within our life cycle we

think that is very likely to occur.” He explained that you can see that the likelihood and the consequence criteria emerge to give you an overall risk assessment category. CAB member Bridges asked if one can clearly distinguish between the likely and the unlikely event. Mr. Bumgardner said that in many cases it is very clear but that there are some cases where if you’re right on the edge you’re going to have to judge what side it falls on and gave an example of equipment failure risk; he said you have a pretty good idea of how often equipment has failed over the life of the facility, so you have a good idea of what area it is going to fall into. He stated that if you have new equipment that has never run before, it would be harder to judge.

CAB member Bridges asked Mr. Bumgardner to comment on how these decisions are made and the team of experts. Mr. Bumgardner answered that it is part of the annual risk review and said they have a person who works as a risk management expert who runs meetings with a team of experts from a facility that has people most familiar with how that process operates, and how often it fails, and it goes through a systematic review to understand where you would put each of these things. He referred to a slide that displayed a risk assessment form.

CAB member Jayaraman referred to a hydrological assessment that records rainfall over the years and asked if there is anything like this within Mr. Bumgardner’s System Planning. Mr. Bumgardner said they don’t have a similar guidebook, but referred to equipment failure, stating that you know how often that equipment has failed in the last 20 years of operation, or if you don’t know, you can go look at where it is operating in other facilities. He said there are some hard facts, and some judgment, and that is why they bring in a team of experts.

Mr. Bumgardner referred to an illustration of what is reviewed on a monthly basis and explained that with all of the background information in mind, the current top 10 risks for the program include equipment reliability, major system failure, tank space availability, tank leak sites reduce useable space, characterization of waste, technology readiness, salt waste processing facility start-up delayed or processing rate limited, meeting tank cleanliness requirements for closure, availability of closure documentation and integration/coupling of execution activities.

He commented that since July 2009 there have been some changes such as the System Health Reporting Program; it is now fully implemented. Salt was taken out of Tank 25, which means it is in drop tank service and more than 200 canisters were processed. He explained that 510 kilogallons of salt solution was processed through the Interim Salt Disposition Project, the number of tanks in the waste removal process have increased, the enhanced chemical cleaning testing has progressed, there are ready-to-deploy Melter Bubblers in the Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF) this fall, Tanks 18 and 19’s residual characterization is in progress and preliminary planning for Supplemental Salt Treatment is progressing.

Mr. Bumgardner summarized his presentation by stating that their Risk Management Program is consistent with a typical Project Management Process, it covers the entire Liquid Waste lifecycle, it has multiple categories, changes over time and there are no risks that will prevent program completion.

CAB member Stanley Howard commented that on the Risk Profile Change page it says “Ready to deploy Melter,” and then mentioned a letter written by a public commenter, J.B. Pickett, about the deployment of the Melter; CAB member Howard asked if anyone has looked at the letter. Mr. Bumgardner said they have looked at the letter and they are putting together some responses. Jim Folk, DOE, stated that they have received a draft of the response the week prior and DOE anticipates having a final response shortly.

Presentation: Saltstone Overview- Steve Wilkerson, Savannah River Remediation (SRR)

Mr. Wilkerson began by saying his presentation was going to be a quick overview on Saltstone and that Mr. Mark Schmitz would talk specifically on the vaults. Mr. Wilkerson introduced himself as the Waste Treatment Manager; he said he is responsible for running Saltstone and DWPF.

Mr. Wilkerson reviewed key events such as the Radiation Absorption Dose (RAD) startup in 1990, and noted that in 2006 there were major modifications to the plant in order to support the program, Actinide Removal Process (ARP) and the Modular Caustic Side Solvent Extraction Unit (MCU). He explained that

the biggest change was taking it up so it could handle the higher curie loading of material to process through the plant.

He stated that the Saltstone facility brings dry feeds through the system such as fly ash, cement, and slag. (The dry feeds will then mix with the liquid feed being processed and send the mix into the hopper and the hopper gives the surge volume as they're operating in the plant.) Mr. Wilkerson explained that one of the big changes they made to the plant in terms of the .2 curie model was to significantly reduce the size of the hopper. He stated that the materials they are bringing into the plant are a lower curie content than the material at risk.

He explained that recently they have had several cases in Saltstone of long durations of planned and unplanned outages, but added that the Saltstone facility has continued to meet the mission needs. He stated that the Saltstone facility can run an average of 30,000-35,000 gallons per day. He commented that ARP and MCU, running at max capacity, will put around 40,000 gallons a week into the system, indicating that the Saltstone facility has a much larger capacity than all the influx coming into it.

Mr. Wilkerson noted that an Operational Improvement Plan has been implemented to position the facility to support higher future throughput from Salt Water Processing Facility (SWPF) and Supplemental Salt Processes. He added this is necessary because ARP and MCU are its major suppliers, with H Canyon and the Effluent Treatment Project (ETP) supplying around 5,000 a week. He explained that if you look in the future when ARP and MCU shuts down, Saltstone will still bring a small amount in with ETP, but when SWPF comes online, the peak flow rates at 270,000 gallons a week. He said they are going to go from needing to process 40,000 gallons per day to needing to process 370,000 gallons per week; the mission of Saltstone is changing. He said he would estimate that Saltstone runs 175,000 gallons a week based on an average of 35,000 gallons per day, but that is not enough.

CAB member Jayaraman commented that conventional water treatment plants run as a continuous flow process and said, from what he understands, Saltstone is running on a batch process; he asked why Saltstone is run this way. Mr. Wilkerson said this was true and that it came from an economic stand point. He said that Saltstone was a 4-day a week system and is now a 7-day system and explained that the demand on the system does not warrant running it around the clock. CAB member Ortaldo commented that he believes the answer to CAB member Jayaraman's question is that there is not enough feed to run 24/7. Mr. Wilkerson said this was correct and confirmed they are transitioning into running 24/7.

CAB member Bridges asked if what Mr. Wilkerson described involves much capital outlay. Mr. Wilkerson said it does.

He concluded his presentation by saying that Saltstone operations fulfill the mission requirements of workforce safety, process safety, environmental stewardship and life cycle objective.

CAB member Ortaldo commented that several years ago when they were looking at the big operations, such as having everything integrated (SWPF) running by 2016, there was a lot of concern that Saltstone would be the limiting piece of the big puzzle. He asked if this is still the case and where Saltstone fits because it is the bottleneck. Mr. Wilkerson answered that Saltstone can become that bottleneck; all of those activities in the Operational Improvement Plan is to get in front of those things, to be ready when SWPF comes on in 2013, to have the right level of capacity, right level of attainment, and right level of reliability. He said this is why they are starting now, so to not limit the system.

CAB member Ortaldo introduced Mr. Schmitz by saying that in Saltstone the salt waste gets pumped into long, skinny-looking buildings, and the new designs, which Mr. Schmitz is going to talk about, are like big round tanks. He added that Mr. Schmitz is going to supply an update on how things are going with the new design and construction.

Presentation: Saltstone Overview- Mark Schmitz, Savannah River Remediation

Mr. Schmitz introduced himself as a project director at SRS and explained that Saltstone is currently

transitioning over to rectangular-shaped vaults. He said that through process study, a new type of vault arrangement was created, a “municipal water tank design.” He described it as a concrete structure that is 150 foot in diameter, with a three-level floor that is all enforced concrete. There were two units. As a size reference, Mr. Schmitz said if we were to superimpose a football field around the unit, the footprint of those two tanks would fit perfectly inside of the football field from goal post to goal post, sideline to sideline.

Mr. Schmitz stated that each one holds 2.9 million gallons of grout and that this is important for their integrity because the decontaminated solution goes into the vessels and will be buried onsite. He then referenced a conceptual design of what will happen once each unit is filled and said that there will be a final closure cap that will be put over them.

CAB member Bridges asked if the isotopes tend to be long-lived or short-lived. Mr. Schmitz deferred to Ginger Dickert. CAB member Bridges then asked how much radiation it would have. Ms. Dickert responded that the radionuclide most dominate in the Saltstone facility is Cesium; it has a 30-year half life. She said as they continue with the MCU, the salt waste processing facility can take that out and it will just be trace contaminants.

Mr. Schmitz stated that there have been some issues with the water tightness of the two vessels and referred to a slide. He said there are three primary considerations for water tightness; in the Saltstone Disposal Facility Permit, it requires a watertight tank that uses an engineered containment system. He added that in the Consent Order, it requires a watertight design to prevent infiltration during waste placement and limit infiltration after closure.

CAB Chair Bettencourt asked for an explanation the Consent Order of Dismissal. Mr. Schmitz answered that it was a suit brought against the DOE and SCDHEC on the vaults and the seam on the outside of the vaults. Karen Guevara interjected that the suit was brought by seven parties looking at the plans for salt processing overall. She said it was a challenge to the Saltstone landfill permit and as part of the settlement of that suit, there was an agreement for certain design configurations for future disposal units.

Regarding performance assessments, Mr. Schmitz said it models 8 inches of water type by type 5 concrete. He continued that the current status is both Salt Disposal Units (SDU) 2A and 2B are in the construction phase and the initial acceptance testing is in progress. He stated that as a result of hydrostatic testing, with dye in both tanks, neither demonstrated water tightness. He said there are two areas of concern where they have seen dampness along two interfaces.

He explained that so far they’ve added significant management attention to the vaults. They’ve assigned research augmentations, gathered support for the “war room” and worked with concrete experts. He continued that the Engineering Improvement Team’s Evaluation and Recommendation to Senior Management is due on August 31.

CAB member Bridges asked if the tensioning wires are pre-stretched and then placed into position. Mr. Schmitz said yes, they are formed first, and then stretched. CAB member Watson asked if the team knows yet what is causing the leak at the base of the facility. Mr. Schmitz said there are two things they think is causing the leak: joints that are poured concrete and a series of anchor bolts.

CAB member Ortaldo asked if the construction on the vaults is significantly different than how domestic concrete water tanks are constructed. Mr. Schmitz said it is not. CAB member Ortaldo asked if it’s basically the same idea or concept. Mr. Schmitz said that the contractor who built and designed it specializes in water tanks.

CAB member Howard asked what was the reasoning behind all of the sections being made with concrete and asked if steel containment would have worked. Mr. Schmitz answered that type 5 concrete gives a much better performance than steel and steel will eventually be gone, while concrete is much better to prevent radioactive nuclide penetration.

Administrative Committee- Sarah Watson, Chair

CAB member Watson briefly went over her committee's mission and introduced her Co-Chairs, Kathe Golden and Denise Long.

She asked CAB members to take note that the membership campaign is underway and to encourage interested parties to join the CAB. She stated the new committee schedule was at each CAB member's seat and she asked them to note their committee meetings' date and time. She then reminded CAB members that they can also attend e-meetings, and referred to the manual on attendance, stating that attendance is required. She added that if someone is unable to attend any meeting they need to let the staff know or the chair of the committee.

She continued that she knows there has been some feedback on the committees having two meetings per day, and said they will adhere to that schedule until the end of the year. More information in regard to committee scheduling will be available soon.

She noted that the Spring newsletter is out and asked each CAB member to pick up a copy, share it, and prepare thoughts and ideas for the upcoming issue. She announced that the CAB retreat is scheduled for October 28-30 in Aiken and encouraged every CAB member to be in attendance. She explained it is different from the retreats in the past; it has been extended to 2 and 1/2 days because the CAB is given a good deal of information and the extra time is needed. She encouraged members with suggestions or ideas they want on the retreat agenda to pass them on to her, or the support staff, so they can be sure to cover the necessary items.

She concluded her report by stating that there was an Executive Committee Meeting scheduled for that afternoon.

Public Comments~

Mr. Clements, Friends of the Earth, said that he appreciated that people asked questions about the proposal from the Army to use SRS for training and that he has some concerns about it because he doesn't know if the future use of the Site is being usurped by the Army. He commented that he doesn't see any economic benefit for the local community and that he would like to know what the long term impact is on potential use of the Site for other purposes. He stated he doesn't know where that is being addressed and he hopes that when the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) comes out there will be a community meeting and discussion, although it might not be required, on how this plan will impact the long term use of the Site. He said he was "shocked" when Mr. McLean said that deployment at SRS would be treated like a foreign nation deployment and called the Site the "Supreme Republic of Savannistan." He stated that he viewed that as a political statement and asked if Mr. McLean is referring to preparing for invasion of Afghanistan, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, or Kurdistan. He said he thinks the Army and DOE need to be careful in terminology within proposals and he hopes he doesn't see that again.

He continued by stating that concerning the last issue that was raised about the cells and possible leaking, he is happy that NRC was in attendance. He said he thinks it is probably because of the NRC that we knew about the fact that the test of the tanks had problems and that the NRC is a regulatory agency and they have an observation role on the salt waste project at SRS. He continued that NRC constantly posts documents online, unlike the DOE. He said he thinks that NRC played an important role and thanked them for having oversight and observational involvement, and stated that this really shows in the Saltstone tank status that the NRC has a valuable role.

Mr. Clements commented, in reference to the Yucca Mountain disposition of high-level waste at SRS that two weeks ago the Blue Ribbon Commission met in Richland, Washington and had a tour of the Site. He said two upcoming dates, with TBD times, are in September and November; he thinks they will meet in Aiken and have a tour of the Site. He stated that if anyone has an interest in what the Blue Ribbon Commission is going to recommend, he suggests they pay attention. He said that he believes the meeting will be held in November, which he thinks will be the last meeting away from Washington, and says he

plans to attend it. He continued that he is concerned that some people are going to use the Yucca Mountain situation to turn SRS into a spent fuel storage facility and processing site.

Concerning high-level waste at Savannah River, Mr. Clements said that he keeps track of his recommendations to the CAB. He stated that he requested through the CAB, of DOE, a report on exactly what the make-up is of depleted Uranium. He said this was at the January meeting and was told there would be a response, but there has been none. He noted that he understands that the CAB is not currently discussing that topic and that he will keep asking about it. He added that at a committee meeting in May, he asked DOE through the CAB to please tell him what the disposition pathway was for all the high-level waste at SRS. He commented that they know that Yucca Mountain was only going to be 7,000 metric tons of high-level waste and according to environmental impact statement, on the Yucca Mountain project there was only enough for 8,300 high-level waste canisters from the entire DOE complex. He stated that the number produced at SRS alone will be over 7,000. He noted that as far as he can tell, and he can't get an answer from DOE for clarification, that there was never a plan to remove the bulk of the waste from the DOE sites. He said that if there was going to be over 20,000 canisters filled, it should be noted that there was only room for 8,300. He encouraged the CAB to find out what was the plan for disposition of that waste and said they need some answers to know what the DOE plans were if Yucca Mountain was there or wasn't there.

Karen Patterson introduced herself as the director with Citizens for Nuclear Technology Awareness and said she was there for Dr. Susan Wood. Ms. Patterson said that Ms. Wood is offering the members of the CAB an opportunity to visit Phoenix at the end of next Winter to present papers. She said that Karen Guevara, Sonny Goldston, Susan Wood, and others, are organizing a tract on public involvement in communications and education. She said it is titled "The Citizen's Voice: Impacts of the Nuclear Renaissance through Public Involvement including the Yucca Mountain decision and Other Waste Management Decisions." She noted that this CAB has a strong precedent for presenting papers at the Waste Management Conference and that Ms. Wood is interested in having at least one CAB member present. She said that abstracts are due by August 13.

Ms. Freeman thanked the day's presenters and their "lifelines." She announced that the Executive Meeting would be taking place in a few moments.

Tuesday, July 27 2010: Attendance

SRS CAB Members

Dr. Emile Bernard
Manuel Bettencourt
Dr. Donald Bridges
Edward Burke
Arthur Domby
Judith Greene-McLeod
Lee Harley-Fitts
Dr. Rose Hayes
Stanley Howard
Dr. Kuppuswamy Jayaraman
Ranowul Jzar
Cleveland Latimore
Joseph Ortaldo
Dr. Marolyn Parson
Skye Vereen
John Snedeker
Dr. Gerald Wadley
Sarah Watson
Alex Williams
Kathe Golden-*Absent*
Tabitha Barrett-*Absent*
Denise Long-*Absent*
Madeleine Marshall-*Absent*

Agency Liaisons

Cathy Amoroso, EPA
Al Frazier, GADNR
Karen Guevara, DOE-SR
Heather Cathcart, SCDHEC
Kim Newell, SCDHEC

Regulators

Kyle Bryant, EPA
David Williams, EPA
Rachel Hall, EPA
Crystal Robertson, SCDHEC
Gregory Suber, NRC
Nishka Devaser, NRC

DOE/OTHER

Jack Craig, DOE-SR
Terry Spears, DOE-SR
Brenda Mills, DOE-SR
Maxcine Maxted, DOE-SR
Becky Craft, DOE-SR
Gerri Flemming, DOE-SR
Rich Olsen, DOE-SR
Dianna Hannah, DOE-SR
Charles Borup, DOE-SR
Sherri Ross, DOE-SR

Contractors

Ginger Dickert, SRR
Rachel Hinckley, SRR
Nancye Bethurem, SRR
Garry Flowers, SRNS
Bill Austin, SRNS
Lyddie Hansen, SRNS
Josh Streetman, SRNS
Jeff Newman, SRNS
Jeanette Hyatt, SRNS
Sonny Goldston, SRNS
Paul Sauerborn, SRNS
Eloy Saldiver, SRNS
Elmer Wilhite, SRNS
Charles Nickell, SRNS
Kim Cauthen, SRNS
Mtesa Wright, SRNS
Erica Williams, V3
Bill Brizes, V3
Jenny Freeman, V3
Ashley Whitaker, V3

Stakeholders

Tom Clements
Liz Goodson
Murray Riley
Karen Patterson
Charles Hanson
Brendolyn Jenkins
Nancy Bobbitt
Jim Hussey
Frank Boulineau
Sam Booher
Eddie Watson
Gregg Birmingham
Chris Reno

The Facilitator reviewed the ground rules, agenda and meeting procedures. (She was asked to do a brief safety topic and she chose to talk about the need for seatbelts.) She then asked everyone to state their name before speaking and reminded everyone of the public comment periods scheduled throughout the day.

CAB Chair Bettencourt called to approve May's meeting minutes. He reiterated that everyone has to state his or her name before speaking and asked if there were any comments on the minutes.

CAB member Bernard commented that on page 10 of May's meeting minutes, they had talked about what the loading for the canisters would be, but it drops off and says "Please explain why the 897 number is a valid number." He said he believes there was a comment made that CAB member Domby would take this back and prepare it for submission the following day. CAB member Bernard commented that, to the reader that doesn't know what's going on, it's like "So what?" He stated that he believes there was a suggestion about taking all the comments and addressing them in the rewrite and preparation of the recommendation. CAB Chair Bettencourt said he wants to first ask if CAB member Domby recalls anything related to that. He added that he is reluctant to suggest any changes because the minutes are taken from the tapes at the meetings so it would have to be something that was purposely left out. CAB member Domby commented that there were one or two editorial changes made. He suggested that they amend it by saying there were some editorial changes made to the recommendation. CAB member Ortaldo commented to CAB member Bernard that they would look at the response to the recommendation.

CAB member Bernard stated, in reference to Tom Clement's comment the day prior about a request he made that has gone unanswered, that on page 22 there is a note addressing the issue; he told Mr. Clements that the CAB has not ignored him.

CAB Chair Bettencourt motioned for the minutes to be approved. Of the 19 CAB members present all approved.

Ms. Freeman introduced Karen Guevara, DDFO, for agency updates. Ms. Guevara welcomed everyone and said that she enjoys her time working with the CAB. Ms. Guevara welcomed Jack Craig, DOE-SR, Acting Site Manager and asked him to say a few words.

Jack Craig- Acting Manager, DOE-SR

Mr. Craig thanked everyone for the work they do and said he has first-hand knowledge with working with Citizen Advisory Boards, and knows how important their input is. He commented that he is still the Acting Site Manager and does not have an update on the selection process, but the official selection should occur within a month. He said that everyone will hear from Ms. Guevara about work going on, but he wanted to mention the work with the Recovery Act; he said a good deal of progress has taken place. He stated that a milestone of the Recovery Act is to reduce the operating footprint of the Site by 75 percent for clean-up work. He announced that at the end of the month they will be recognizing a milestone because 50 square miles have been cleaned through the Recovery Act. He said most of this clean-up was in M Area and added that through the Recovery Act, there has been a good deal of work with TRU waste. He commented that one month ago a worker punctured his hand while working in a glove box, processing TRU waste; he explained there was some internal radiation that resulted from that and a type B investigation began the previous week where the department does the investigation of the event. Jeff Allison is leading that review for the department and it should be done within the next three to four weeks.

Mr. Craig stated that they are still working on their budgets. He said Congress has given some feedback on the 2011 budget, but it may or may not approve the budget by the end of the year. He said that the 2012 budget is working its way through the process and there is good news on that, too. He asked Garry Flowers to say a few words.

Garry Flowers- President, Savannah River Nuclear Solutions (SRNS)

Mr. Flowers introduced himself and announced that in a few days SRNS would celebrate its second year at SRS. He added that in one month he would be celebrating his one-year anniversary at SRNS, and that SRNS has made great progress and will begin publishing accomplishments.

He stated that the issue with the glove box was very unfortunate; he explained that they were taking canister and drums from various sites that had been buried for years. He continued that they have to puncture each canister before they go to WIPP so they can be seen. He commented that even though SRNS has spent hours of training, the worker took it upon himself to change the procedure and as a result, the tip of the wire went through with his gloves and a quarter inch into his right hand. The worker was kelated immediately and the work was halted. He said that the medical response procedures were followed and that a group out of Oakridge called REACTS came down and said that everything was done right. The injured man is doing well and they are waiting to find out what the dosage is going to be. Mr. Flowers said he is proud of the team for reacting the way it did and they will wait for the results of the investigation before resuming work.

He updated the CAB that soon they are going to announce the new Lab Director of Savannah River National Laboratory (and that they are very happy to bring in the first person that was on their list). He said the lab is a great asset to the state and they want to continue to expand the mission. He believes that bringing in some of the outside private entities that have an interest in renewable energy and algae to fuel is a good idea. He concluded by reminding everyone that in two days SRNS would celebrate its two-year anniversary.

CAB member Bridges asked Mr. Flowers what his two most striking accomplishments were within his career at SRNS. Mr. Flowers answered that SRNS has the Recovery Act structured as a true business from execution to metrics and measurements. He said they know where they want to go and more importantly, how to get there. He continued that for the SRNS two-year anniversary, he thinks they are bringing the best business practices to the Site and they are very close to getting their base line finalized for the MOU contract. He explained that more importantly, they are forming a tool for transparency to show where the money is going, how it is being spent and where one can look by cost account, materials, and man hours.

CAB member Ortaldo asked if the injured worker was a subcontractor or a long-time Site employee. Mr. Flowers answered that the man was not a long-time Site employee but had worked on DOE Sites before in Ohio. CAB member Ortaldo asked if Mr. Flowers has seen any trend in subcontractors being injured and if there is any difference between them and the full time Site employees. Mr. Flowers said no, and explained that the majority of people they had brought in under the Recovery Act are subcontractors, and he said they have a very low incident occurrence. He continued that these workers come in and don't get comfortable; the problem with full time employees that have worked on Site for years is that they do get comfortable, and complacent, according to Mr. Flowers. He went on to explain that the subcontractors, depending on what task they're assigned to, are getting a good deal of training, a good deal of mock-up training, and a good deal of orientation on what it means to work safely on a DOE site. He continued that for the most part, those brought on Site for the Recovery Act have worked out very well and he is pleased with their work.

Karen Guevara, Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO- Agency Updates)

Ms. Guevara thanked Mr. Craig and Mr. Flowers for their updates and said she would highlight items of interest in her agency update. She commented that the 14th SRS public tour was just hosted and that she knows the opportunity to host the tour is of high interest to the CAB. She stated that she is pleased, based on the CAB's recommendation, to both continue tours and increase the number of tours as they go into the next fiscal year. She added that last month on June 22-June 24, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) conducted an audit at the Site to review the Spent Nuclear Fuel Program, the High-level waste Program and Plutonium Disposition in L Basin. She noted that the GAO also extended to the CAB members a special invitation to meet with them in a closed session to discuss its views on the impacts of not opening the Yucca Mountain Deep Geological Repository. She added that they are pleased that seven

CAB members did attend this meeting, asked questions and expressed concerns. She continued that on July 13-14, NRC met in Aiken with personnel from the DOE Headquarters offices, from DOE at SRS, and the SRS liquid waste contractors, Savannah River Remediation, in both working group and public meeting to discuss the development of the draft F-Tank Farm 3116 basis document. She stated that the entire meeting was placed online and several CAB members, and former CAB members, attended the meeting either at the facility or online. She informed the CAB that for anyone who was unable to attend, a meeting synopsis will be provided during the Waste Management Committee's report later that day.

She stated that the Annual Teaching Radiation, Energy and Technology (TREAT) Workshop was being held that week at the University of South Carolina-Aiken. The workshop is funded through an Environmental Justice grant from DOE Headquarters; participants included 25 math and science teachers from the area. She stated that the workshop's goal was to provide education training and experimental opportunities for local area school teachers to learn about environmental radiation, energy and technology for use in their classrooms. These teachers will be evaluated over the year to measure the success of the workshop.

Ms. Guevara continued that they are happy to be the first EM-DOE Federal Agency to host Environmental Justice Training. She added the EJ training is scheduled for July 29 at SRS and the purpose of such training is to help Federal and contractor employees gain a greater awareness of Environmental Justice, and strategies for incorporating Environmental Justice into DOE policies, decisions and activities. She said that the CAB would be hearing more on another initiative that the DOE is proud to support, the Superfund Job Training Initiative, later that day in a presentation from the EPA. Ms. Guevara noted the announcement of the newly appointed Vice Chairperson at the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, Ms. Jessie Hill Roberson. She said that Ms. Roberson is no stranger, having served in an Environmental Management leadership position at both SRS and DOE Headquarters. Ms. Roberson will be visiting the Site early next month to become reacquainted with the Site's procedures and policies.

She stated that on July 19th, DOE's National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) announced its intent to modify the scope of the ongoing Surplus Plutonium Disposition (SPD) Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS). She continued that DOE now intends to revise the scope of the SPD SEIS to include disposition alternatives for plutonium declared surplus to the nation's defense needs in 2008 and additional alternatives for disposition of certain non-pit plutonium materials currently in safe storage at SRS. She said that DOE is not reconsidering decisions already made to dispositions surplus plutonium except to construct a stand-alone Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility. As cooperating agencies with the SPD SICE, DOE and the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) will also evaluate the impacts of using mixed oxide fuel manufactured from surplus plutonium should TVA choose to use it to fuel its Reactors. She stated that the SPD SEIS will analyze the potential environmental impacts of alternatives to disposition approximately 13 metric tons of surplus plutonium, including approximately seven metric tons of plutonium from retired weapons pits and six metric tons of non-pit plutonium. She announced that during the 60-day comment period, DOE will hold five public meetings in Alabama, New Mexico and Tennessee, as well as in North Augusta, SC on August 17.

She stated that an "exciting" event coming up is the "Celebrate Aiken: Discovery of the Neutrino Event." It will be held on August 17 and is part of Aiken's 175th year celebration. She added that on that day there will be a celebration at University of South Carolina-Aiken to commemorate the Neutrino discovery. She continued that in 1955, Frederick Reines and Clyde Cowan worked at SRS and set up their experiments at the P Reactor in an effort to confirm the existence of the postulated Neutrino; the experimental confirmation was achieved in 1956. She stated that the celebration would include the installation of historical markers and plaques at SRS and relevant papers will be presented, and that the event is sponsored by the SRS Heritage Foundation, Citizens for Nuclear Technology Awareness (CNTA), the University of South Carolina-Aiken, and the Savannah River National Laboratory (SRNL). She noted that another celebration is in the works to commemorate the completion of M Area remediation and facility decommissioning; this celebration will occur in late September or early October. M Area will be the second of the 14 large, industrial areas to be completed and follows T Area, which was completed in 2006.

She continued by stating that the day before, the CAB received a thorough update on important components of the liquid waste program such as Saltstone, as well as a progress report on the Savannah River Site Recovery Act Project. She then summarized and listed the presentations that would be presented later that day. Ms. Guevara updated the CAB with information concerning the Defense Waste Processing Facility.

Ms. Guevara concluded her agency update and thanked everyone for their concern and hard work.

CAB Chair Bettencourt asked if they have resolved the 1.3 billion versus 1.6 billion ARRA contract issue yet. Ms. Guevara referred to a sheet brought to the last CAB meeting that listed statistics on what amount of the ARRA funding the DOE had actually committed to contracts that appeared to show a discrepancy; she said she wished they had someone there from the ARRA. She continued that her recollection is that it's not an error as much as it was a sequencing of paper, but said she still owed him an answer. Mr. Craig apologized to CAB Chair Bettencourt that they hadn't gotten him the information yet, but stated that SRS got 1.6 billion of Recovery Act money; roughly 1.4 went to SRNS and 200 million went to SRR. Mr. Craig continued by saying that was the answer to CAB Chair Bettencourt's question and addressed the discrepancy by saying he wanted to explain how that paperwork got misunderstood. CAB Chair Bettencourt interjected that as of seven to eight days prior, the ARRA Web Site was still reflecting the 1.3 billion on contract as opposed to 1.6.

CAB member Ortaldo asked Ms. Guevara if the Salt Waste Processing Facility (SWPF) is still on schedule for 2013 startup. Terry Spears, DOE, came up and stated that he's not a member of the SWPF team, but it is one of the facilities he will inherit. He stated that the earliest startup date scheduled for the SWPF is December 2013. He added that at this time the facility is on track for that startup, and that during construction there is a deal of risk faced and that he's not going to say that will endure forever. CAB member Ortaldo commented that SWPF is one of the major critical path items on the system plan. He commented that if SWPF does not get started on schedule, the whole plan slips.

CAB member Bridges asked if there was going to be a celebration for their 3,000th canister. Ms. Guevara deferred to Mr. Spears, who answered they haven't planned a celebration yet, although the achievement is a big one and thanked him for recognizing the accomplishment.

Cathy Amoroso, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)- Agency Update

Ms. Amoroso introduced herself as one of five project managers with the EPA for SRS.

Ms. Amoroso introduced EPA Section Chief, David Williams, who handles all federal facilities in South Carolina, North Carolina and Georgia. She also introduced Kyle Bryant, Community Involvement Coordinator with the EPA, who has experience in a variety of technical programs and was very involved in the Superfund Program.

Ms. Amoroso began by thanking the CAB for its support of the Superfund Job Training Initiative. She was pleased to announce that they just finished its second round and graduated 39 people on July 9; all 39 were at work on July 12 at the Savannah River Remediation Company. She continued that the jobs are very high quality and that the people in the community are "thrilled" to have them. She stated that many of the applicants were from Allendale, Aiken, and other surrounding communities where there is a great deal of unemployment.

She announced that the EPA will fund a third round of Superfund Job Training, to be announced in the Fall with training starting in January and February; graduation will take place in the Spring. She said the first two rounds were funded by EPA Headquarters and the third round will be funded by Region 4 and they are working with the DOE to secure help from them as well. The planning process begins in September.

She stated that at the last CAB meeting there was a question about EPA's role in the program at SRS. She said she has talked to CAB member Jayaraman and he has invited her to do a presentation at one of his committee meetings about EPA's role in the clean-up program. She gave a brief overview of EPA's role in SRS. She commented that the EPA listed SRS on the National Priority's List, which is a list of hazardous

waste sites in the country that will be cleaned up under the Superfund national clean-up program. Once EPA listed SRS on the list, she said it opened the door to a three-party agreement, called the Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) with DHEC, EPA and the DOE. She said that this agreement sets out the requirements for investigating a clean-up site, the closure of the tanks, and sets out a schedule. She explained that it is an enforceable guiding agreement for the clean-up and tank closure. She stated that is a general way that EPA fits in, as they are the regulating agency for Superfund Legislation and DOE is the lead implementing agency responsible for the clean-up. She explained that the EPA is responsible for oversight and regulation; DOE is not self-regulating, as the EPA and DHEC oversees the clean-up.

She added that the clean-up program is moving along quickly and there is a good working relationship between the DOE, DHEC, EPA and the DOE's contractors. She stated that there is a very long list of what the clean-up has done since the last CAB meeting. She added that they have recently signed the P Area ROD, recently completed the action memo on E-cods, the ECAT on the Small Arms Training Area, are currently working on final revisions on the ROD for Gun site 218, and just finished reviewing the annual monitoring reports for the chemicals, metals, and pesticides pits, which was important because it documented the successful clean-up of the soil. This involved electric resistance heating of the soil to clean it up. She said there is ongoing monitoring of the groundwater to determine whether or not the plume will be able to naturally attenuate or if it will need a more active remedy. She stated that right now they are actively working on the proposed plan for Gun site 12 and it will go out for public comment soon. She continued that the A Area miscellaneous rubble pile had a performance evaluation and they just finished the Lanious Control Implementation Plan for C, K, and L Reactor complexes. She said they have a proposed plan for the R Area out and a variety of annual assessment reports for some of the sites that have RODs. She spoke about a deer Cesium study and the Pembranch Integrator Operable Unit (OU) periodic report; and that they are closely following the progress of P and R Reactors and daily field oversight of DOE activities. She continued that they are closely following the Treatability Studies at the P Area and they are looking at a couple different groundwater technologies that may be able to help the groundwater remedies. She also stated that the Treatability Study in D Area has been completed and was successful in taking Tritium out of contaminated soil. She said the EPA continues to work closely with the DOE and DHEC on the tank closure program; this is a high priority for everyone. She announced that they have a big milestone coming up on September 30 for the bulk waste removal of two more tanks and that the EPA continues to be interested in DOE's efforts to improve the capacity of the throughput of the Defense Waste Processing Facility because they need to improve that capacity in order to meet the FFA closure requirements. She commented that it looks like it is going well and that the EPA is still interested in the Waste Determination Draft document that has to do with F Tank Farms.

She said she wanted to mention to the CAB that the EPA has proposed plans, RODs, and ECATS out for public review. She added that when they get the environmental bulletin, it announces the availability of those kinds of documents for review. She stated that they don't get comments often so they are interested in hearing what people think about those decision documents. She encouraged the CAB to look over the proposed plans and give feedback. She stated that the EPA is currently reviewing the SRS Community Involvement Plan and the EPA is interested in the CAB's feedback on how to reach out to the community. She explained that this is a big priority for the EPA as it has a new Community Engagement Initiative. She informed the CAB that if anyone has any ideas to involve the community, they would be happy to hear it. EPA appreciates being kept in the loop by receiving correspondence between the CAB and Mr. Craig regarding CAB Recommendation 269.

She stated that EPA has recently issued guidance considering Environmental Justice during the development of actions. This was released July 26 and she will report back to the CAB after she has a chance to see what it says. She added that the EPA appreciated hearing from the Army on July 26, as well as in a previous CAB committee meeting, regarding the Army's plan to use SRS for training round. She said that the EPA is very interested in this development, primarily because their interests are both in protecting remedies they have at the Site, such as monitoring wells or other physical remedies, and protecting soldiers from any type of hazard that might be out there. EPA wants to continue enforcing land use controls and making sure that the entities of the properties is consistent with the environmental condition of the property. She stated that has been, for a number of years, a mindset of SRS being a type of in perpetuity controlled by DOE and it is somewhat of a change of mindset to think of other groups using

the property, but she stated that the property is an amazing resource that should be used. She concluded that the EPA will stay in close contact with DOE, the Army and DHEC on this issue.

CAB member Jayaraman thanked Ms. Amoroso and said she has tried to give the Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) a very good view of what the EPA is doing, especially as a regulatory agency.

Shelly Wilson, SC Department of Health & Environmental Concern (SCDHEC)- Agency Update

Ms. Wilson gave an update on SCDHEC's budget situation; stating that its current state dollars sit at 81 million and that it sounds like a good deal of money until you contrast it with a few years ago when it was at 148 million. The effects of this budget drop can be seen in several areas of DHEC such as one area where there are three people trying to do the work that eight people used to do and much of SCDHEC's water monitoring has been cut or dropped. Ms. Wilson continued that on the upside, South Carolina is a state that has done more of that than most so it has a very vast history of heavy data and a great trend analysis that they've developed.

In relation to the issue of the budget cuts, Ms. Wilson stated that SCDHEC is still continuing to perform work and much of it is in relation to SRS. She stated that SCDHEC is involved in the many things that Ms. Amoroso mentioned, so she echoed all the work progress Ms. Amoroso stated. Ms. Wilson added that one area SCDHEC wants to highlight is the M Area Operable Unit post-construction walk down, which means that all the work has been completed in M Area and the regulators have had a chance to go walk down and see it.

Ms. Wilson continued that there is a clean-up team that addresses all of the investigation and remedy decisions; she confirmed that SCDHEC is a part of that team but its laws differ from the EPA's. She explained that rather than federal, they have the state authority backing them as part of the clean-up team. She stated that the EPA and SCDHEC has different but well-backed authority on the federal and state level that makes them a "full player" in the clean-up process. She introduced Heather Cathcart and explained that Ms. Cathcart helps manage the SCDHEC team.

The next area Ms. Wilson talked about was the General Closure Plan for the F-Tank Farm at SRS. She said that has been a high area of focus for SCDHEC and they are concentrating on that because the 36 million gallons of high-level waste is a high area of risk because it is in liquid form and in aging tanks, some of which have leak sites. She added that SCDHEC does not currently have a schedule of a public notice for that General Closure Plan because when they go out for public notice they want to be able to give out a full, complete closure plan and they do not have that at this time. When that closure piece is completed they will be able to move forward with the public notice.

Ms. Wilson continued that the SCDHEC's perspective on the Department of Defense training on SRS land is that new land and resources should not be wasted and when old resources or land can be used or shared, it should be. She added that the population is developing around the Department of Defense sites, which means they have a smaller land space to work with and the capability of their training gets bigger as the technology progresses. She concluded that the Department of Defense is finding a decreasing ability to use the lands they have and SCDHEC has worked with the Department of Defense to maximize and share resources when appropriate. To that extent, she stated that SCDHEC supports the Army training on SRS land because it enables both entities to complete their missions and not use other resources that can be maintained in a fairly pristine state. Provided that all of the safety and environmental concerns are addressed, SCDHEC supports the shared resources so that it economizes and minimizes the footprint on the land.

Al Frazier, Georgia Department of Natural Resources (GADNR)- Agency Update

Mr. Frazier began his update by saying he can relate to Ms. Wilson and that the Office of Training and Budget stated that unemployment claims have been steadily decreasing for the past few months; however, he said it is starting to look more promising in Georgia. He also stated that all agencies are required to come up with additional cuts for the mid-course correction in January.

He stated that GADNR has been busy with the oil spill that occurred in the Gulf with speculation on if the oil could ever affect the Georgia, South Carolina and Florida coasts. He explained the possibility exists by a 1 in 20 chance, but it would require a “perfect storm of events” for it to happen. He said that the Lieutenant Governor asked the Senate’s Natural Resource Committee to investigate the problem and see what kind of responses Georgia would have. He explained that the task was given to two agencies within the Department of Natural Resources: the EPA and the Coastal Resources Division.

He commented that the GADNR enlisted the help of a Coast Guard in Savannah’s Department of Community Health and Georgia Agriculture Department. He said that they created an oil spill assessment and Response Incident Plan; this was presented to the Natural Resources Committee on July 22 and was received favorably. He explained that the plan called for three levels of operation including Level Green, which is for the oil that remains in the Gulf, Level Yellow, where the oil made it way along the Straits of Florida, and Level Red, where it is approaching the Florida/Georgia border. He stated that all of the agencies mentioned previously have met with all six Coastal Emergency Management Agency directors and advised them of preparations. He added that local Emergency Planning Committees were informed up and down the coast, and Coast Guards conducted pre-assessment studies on the coast. The Coast Guards looked at getting out and dusting off the area, and contingency plans; this contingency area has already taken into account sensitive areas and looked at actual assets that are on hand because many assets have been depleted because they have been sent to the Gulf to help out there. He said that GADNR came out with a fact sheet in June that was based along the same lines as an earlier fact sheet that came from SCDHEC. He said that the fact sheet addressed what kind of condition the oil would be in if it hit the coast and what a citizen could do if he or she came across something like that.

He listed the names of three ships including the SS Oklahoma, the SO Baton Rouge, and the SS Gulf America. These three ships sank off the Georgia/Florida coast all in the same month, two within the same week. The SS Oklahoma was carrying 4.4 million gallons of crude oil and the SO Baton Rouge was carrying 3.8 million gallons of crude oil, within the same month, the SS Gulf America sank while carrying 90 thousand barrels of crude oil. He concluded there have been spills on the Georgia/Florida coast and the coast survived. He called it a “survivable incident” and added that the GADNR is as ready as it can be right now if any oil makes it to the East coast.

CAB member Jayaraman commented that the CAB knows what South Carolina is doing for SRS and asked what the state of Georgia is doing in regards to SRS’s impact on contamination, river water, ground water contamination and other areas such as jobs. He then asked if GADNR has a team specifically assigned to look into SRS and its impact and activities. CAB member Jayaraman commented that the CAB knows about SCDHEC’s involvement with the EPA and asked if GADNR is also involved.

Mr. Frazier asked CAB member Jayaraman if he was referring to the issue of the oil spill. CAB member Jayaraman commented that was not what he was referring to at all, even though he knows that was the information presented. Mr. Frazier answered that GADNR used to have a team onsite for a specific project that is now completed however, all public water supply systems in Georgia are routinely monitored for radiological parameters.

Public Comments~

Mr. Frank Boulineau, of Hephzibah, Georgia, announced that it was a pleasure to be at the CAB meeting. He commented that he tries to follow the best he can as a citizen what the DOE is doing and what is taking place at SRS. He continued that when people are trying to follow what is taking place, they look to the CAB. He stated that the CAB may be surprised to find out that 98 percent of citizens don’t know it exists. He continued that the purpose of him being there is to say, as a citizen, that they are pleased to know that with the awesome responsibilities the DOE, SRS, and the CAB have, they are all taking their work seriously and working hard. He said as a citizen he is proud and encouraged the CAB to keep working. He added that he wishes, in addition to reading an important article in The Augusta Chronicle about issues such as clean-up work, MOX, and excess plutonium, that he could see a specific article about the representatives of the CAB and what they’re doing. He said he wants most of the citizens to know that the CAB is working hard and doing a good job.

He commented that he wanted to bring to the CAB's attention two agencies that may get less attention including the Army training site; he said he doesn't know how that is going but he was proud when he heard that was being applied for and that there was concern about the integrity of the Site. He continued that the Savannah River Ecology Lab is a love of his and he wants the CAB and the DOE to "keep some breath in it." He concluded by thanking everyone for their hard work, asked them to continue to work hard, and asked them to try to accomplish his requests if possible.

CAB member Domby commented that he is speaking as a public citizen, and said that earlier in the day they talked about the very laudable achievement of about 3,000 canisters by the defense waste processing facility. He continued that as they look at metrics, they have to realize that sometimes the "glass is half empty." He said that as they approach the 3,000th canister, under Rev 15 of the liquid waste plan, they have a total of 7,200 canisters under the base case of this plan. He stated that he realizes that some of these assumptions can change, for the better or for the worse, in terms of increasing the number, but he wants to keep focus on the number of canisters. He added that as they add canisters, even if they increase to 400 canisters per year, there is the potential extension of the total life of the DWPF. This means more money, and more melters, and a lot of operational maintenance cost. He stated that what he wants to raise up again, even though the CAB has a recommendation and a response, is that if there is additional plutonium loading in those canisters at the level of 897 grams per meter cube, the total number of canisters under this Rev 15 would be 10,500. He continued that there are 3,000 that have been done at relatively low levels of radiation compared to what's coming in the future and they have 7,200 under the base case and up to 10,500 unless they increase the plutonium loading. He commented that this is a big issue in terms of life cycle cost for the DWPF and as he transitions off the CAB at the end of this year, he hopes the CAB keeps track of those metrics relevant to DWPF.

Chair Updates ~

Ms. Freeman introduced CAB Chair Bettencourt for the Chair updates. CAB Chair Bettencourt said he would first like for CAB member Bridges to cover some personnel issues.

CAB member Bridges asked everyone who had birthdays since May to stand. He continued that CAB member Watson would be talking about CAB personnel activities in the near future. He added that as they add CAB members they have a "mysterious" grouping of stakeholder balance, diversity and geographic breakdown; he stated that this information is only known by CAB member Watson. He stated that he wants to give an overview of where the CAB is on staffing.

He stated that new member selection will be coming up soon and that the year had been unusual with two resignations and the CAB is going to be losing a significant number of members. CAB member Bridges stated that the CAB has 25 members and they all serve 2-year terms with a 6-year max limit. He commented on the recent resignations, stating that one of the members from the 2010 cycle chose not to serve. He concluded that they now have 23 active members and 10 spots on the board that are going to open this year. He commented that for the 2011 timeframe, the CAB will be losing significant leadership and talent. He asked everyone to think of the contributions these members have made. He called this a wake-up call and urged everyone to encourage others to join and asked CAB members that are still on the board to be more aggressive, knowledgeable and involved. CAB Chair Bettencourt thanked CAB member Bridges and stated that the CAB is working hard because they have no replacement for Sheron and that puts more stress on CAB activities.

CAB Chair Bettencourt continued that Ms. Guevara mentioned Waste Management the day prior and he asked a few people to come up to the mic to talk about Waste Management 2011 in Phoenix. Sonny Goldston, SRNS, introduced himself and said he wanted to talk about what he considered to be the premiere Waste Management conference in the world, which takes place in Phoenix during the last week of February and the first week of March. He stated that he is the Chair of the Public Communications Public Involvement Education and Training track at the conference. He said that much of the work CAB does is critical to the work that he does. He added that Melissa Neilson, who is the CAB Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) manager [director] in Washington D.C. for DOE Headquarters, is involved in planning the event.

He continued that he is very interested in getting the CAB involved and that CAB Chair Bettencourt gave a presentation at the previous year's conference. He added that at the 2011 conference there are two things in particular going on, including the public involvement track and the fact that SRS is the featured site and that Susan Wood, the sponsor from Citizens for Nuclear Technology Awareness, will hold a session titled "Engaging Citizens." He then invited Jeanette Hyatt, the Environmental Director for SRNS, to say a few words.

Ms. Hyatt shared details on specific tracks of the conference: "Communication of Technical Issues"; "Information Management: Retrieval and Evaluation of Historical Data"; "The Citizen's Voice: Impacting the Nuclear Renaissance through Public Involvement"; and "Visitors Centers and Other Public Education Tools." She concluded by stating that the one-paragraph abstract, for presenting at the conference, is due by August 13.

CAB member Parson asked Mr. Goldston if an abstract is accepted, is there a travel budget somewhere to support people going to Phoenix. Mr. Goldston said that is not a question he can answer. Karen Guevara, DDFO, commented that she is pleased with the timing of the abstracts because it is something they need to plan for in the CAB budget, which she said they are beginning to put together now. She said it will require some decisions in terms of how many people are promoting papers they will have to travel to support. She added that it is critical that they get that information and have a conversation with the CAB about decisions to support that involvement and what it means in terms of some tradeoffs of not reimbursing non-committee members to go to committee meetings.

CAB Chair Bettencourt commented that they will be putting their top three issues together in preparation for the EMSSAB Chairs meeting in Santa Fe in September. He stated that all of the four newest recommendations have received responses and they discussed, and updated, the CAB flow chart.

CAB member Hayes stated that she wants to revisit the subject of losing experienced CAB members. She wants to create emeritus status for experienced members who are leaving the Board. She said she would like to know why there is a six year term limit and why can't there be some type of position that will guarantee that the CAB will always have people with backgrounds it can rely on for technical and in depth issues. She wants the CAB to consider putting forth a recommendation to DOE about the issue to resolve it to the CAB's advantage.

Facilitator Update~

Ms. Freeman reported that the CAB has 272 total recommendations, with four pending, fourteen open, and the majority of open recommendations are from the Waste Management Committee. She stated that 254 recommendations have been closed.

Facilities Disposition and Site Remediation Committee- Dr. Kuppuswamy Jayaraman, Chair

CAB member Jayaraman introduced himself, his committee members, and detailed what his committee addresses. He stated that on June 8, his committee held a meeting at the DOE Meeting Center in Aiken. The next meeting is scheduled for August 18, from 3 p.m. to 5 p.m., at the DOE Meeting Center in Aiken.

He encouraged all Committee members to attend for added committee discussions.

Presentation: Heavy Water Components Test Reactor Project Status- Diana Hannah, DOE-SR

Ms. Hannah introduced herself as a federal project director with projects associated with ARRA. She presented information on the background of Heavy Water Components Test Reactor (HWCTR), objectives, the scope, current status and the path forward. She stated that HWCTR was built to test the concept of heavy water moderated reactors for the civilian power industry. She said that is in contrast to the other reactors, which were weapons complex reactors, HWCTR is a good bit smaller.

She explained that HWCTR was built in 1959 and 1960 and operated 1962-1964. She commented that it tested 36 fuel assemblies and being a test reactor, 10 of them failed. She explained that there was contamination in the secondary system and spills throughout the internals. In 1964, the Atomic Energy commission decided to not do anymore tests with it.

CAB member Wadley asked Ms. Hannah how thick the containment wall is. Ms. Hannah answered that the first 30 feet is $\frac{3}{4}$ inch carbon steel, the top 35 feet is $\frac{3}{8}$ carbon steel, and the below portion is reinforced concrete that's 18 inches thick in the sides and 4 to 9 feet thick in the bottom. CAB member Wadley asked how thick the portion was that was cut through to make another opening. Ms. Hannah answered it was $\frac{3}{4}$ inch thick.

She continued that in 1964, HWCTR was stopped, it sat there for a year, and all its fuel assemblies and the neutron sources were removed. In 1965, the decision was made to retire it. It was retired in place with controlled access and maintained for another 10 years with a nitrogen purge. She stated that from 1975-1976, attempts were made to D&D it and then budget constraints prevented that from happening. It then sat there again until the 1990s, and the second attempt to D&D it was made, but budget constraints prevented progress again. She explained that they couldn't D&D it, but they did have a bit of money to extend its surveillance mode, which is supposed to last up to 60 years, welded the door shut, and removed all side auxiliary buildings. She explained that with the ARRA money, they have the money again, so they are now working on their third attempt to D&D HWCTR. She stated that when they attempted to get into HWCTR in 2009, they could not get in because it was closed for so long and they had to cut another hole to get in; she stated that it had gotten rusty.

She stated her objectives as achieving human health and environmental protectiveness by removing 99 percent of the contamination, including standards for industrial workers. She said for the final end state they are going to achieve mechanical completion, have a final walk-down inspection completed and regulatory acceptance will be documented.

She described the scope by stating that the decontamination piece of the work is 10.7 million dollars. She continued that they went through a streamlined regulatory process with their regulators, and they are using the ECA process. She stated that by taking the reactor vessel and the two steam generators out, and everything above the ground, they will get rid of 99 percent of the contamination.

CAB member Hayes asked how many curies are in the reactor vessel. Ms. Hannah answered that they counted around 2,100 curies. CAB Chair Bettencourt asked if the curies are embedded in the metal. Ms. Hannah stated yes and that it's mostly down in the bottom of it.

CAB member Bridges asked if it could be just as easy to simply remove everything they can that's easy and concrete it up. Ms. Hannah said that was one of their alternatives.

She summarized the scope and said that when they are done, everything will be grouted up to ground level, with a three-foot cement cap. Everything will be removed except for the transfer refueling coffin because she explained that they thought it would be better to drop it down into the hole after they remove the reactor vessel and grout it in place. She referred to some pictures that showed the current status of HWCTR and said they have entered four monitoring wells.

CAB member Hayes asked why, unlike the P and R reactors, they have decided to remove HWCTR. Ms. Hannah said that unlike the P and R reactors, HWCTR was not built in place onsite so it gave them an option. CAB member Hayes commented that when they were given a presentation on the P and R reactors, the reasoning they gave for not removing them was the worker exposure; she asked if there is a greater issue there with P and R. Ms. Hannah said there is a greater issue with P and R, and explained that they are four to five times the magnitude in power. CAB member Hayes asked about the disposition of the reactor. Ms. Hannah said it is going to stay in the E Area.

CAB member Parson asked Ms. Hannah since she said 99 percent of contamination would be removed, how it was determined that one percent would be left behind. Ms. Hannah answered that calculations were

done, using P and R reactors, but scaled back, and in the 1990s a huge characterization study done. CAB member Parson commented that since they are removing contamination from one place on the Site to another, the contamination is still going to be on Site but in a different place. Ms. Hannah stated that this was true, but it will now be in an approved site and there will be very little left behind.

Ms. Freeman thanked Ms. Hannah for her presentation and stated that the HWCTR removal will be a visible indicator of how the ARRA funds are being used. CAB member Jayaraman thanked Ms. Hannah for her presentation.

Waste Management Committee- Joe Ortaldo, Chair

CAB member Ortaldo introduced himself, reviewed what was discussed the day prior, and the CAB's meeting with the Government Accountability Office (GAO), where the Yucca Mountain issue was discussed.

CAB member Bridges asked CAB member Ortaldo if he thought he was able to express the passion and fervor the CAB felt at the GAO meeting. CAB member Ortaldo said the basic message the CAB gave the GAO was that the CAB is very concerned and they don't like being told something is no good without any explanation.

CAB member Ortaldo went over all recommendations and said after the relevant presentation later that day, if anyone had any questions about Recommendation 264 to address those to either himself or to CAB member Jayaraman so they can close it.

He announced that the next Waste Management Committee meeting would be on August 24 at 3 p.m. and that the topics being discussed will be on the Top Ten Risk Factors on System Plans and what they can do to reduce these risks.

He stated that his committee would have three presentations and summarized them. He said that he didn't want to oversimplify a complex situation, but that they would be talking about what's required and where they stand on getting the agreement of all the parties as to what they have to do to close more tanks. He explained that part of the problems they have is the issue of what is the definition of high level waste. He continued that high-level waste is not a type of waste that one can put a meter to and say if it is or isn't high level waste. He explained that it's a legislative term, it's not like TRU waste or low-level waste where you can measure and classify it. He added that they find themselves in a situation now where high-level waste is defined differently in the state of South Carolina and Idaho than it is in the rest of the country; this is part of the NDAA 3116 legislation. He said that this is the type of issue and discussion that has gotten the NRC involved.

Presentation: NRC-Waste Incidental to Reprocessing Activities at the Savannah River Site- Greg Suber, Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Mr. Suber introduced himself as the chief of the Low-level Waste Branch and thanked the CAB for the opportunity to present.

Mr. Suber explained that there are two branches at the NRC that work at SRS on Saltstone and other related activities; those two branches are the Low-level Waste Branch and the Performance Assessment Branch. He added that the Low-level Waste Branch does the project management and the Performance Assessment Branch performs technical reviews. He introduced Nishka Devaser as the project manager for Saltstone.

He started his presentation by explaining that the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) gives two responsibilities pertaining to waste incidental processing. He said that the NDAA gives the DOE the responsibility to consult with the NRC when it's making waste determinations. The second responsibility is a monitoring activity which gives the NRC the responsibility to monitor the disposal actions of DOE. He explained that scoping is a process the NRC goes through under consultation, and that H Tank Farm and F-Tank Farm are constantly under consultation. He continued that scoping is when the DOE send the NRC

documents and generally explain to the NRC what the scope of their review is going to be, what they're going to cover, what they're going to consider and what kind of assumptions the NRC can expect to see when the DOE submits to the NRC a performance assessment or waste determination. He explained that the Performance Assessment is an evaluation where the NRC looks at the performance of the proposed disposal action and it's risk-informed and looks at probability. He stated that it is a quantitative examination of how the waste is going to perform when it is disposed of. He explained that the Waste Determination is a statement by the Secretary that says "this waste is not high level waste." He said they do that in consultation with the NRC, and added that there are some criterion, and constraints, that have to be adhered to before making a Waste Determination.

He continued that the NRC takes information on the Performance Assessment and Waste Determination and writes a Technical Evaluation Report. This report looks at the information provided by the DOE and is an expression of the NRC's independent analysis. He said he wants to stress that while the NRC does work with the DOE, the NRC does independently verify the information DOE puts in its documents. He then explained that an observation is a Site visit and that under monitoring, the NRC does both observations and technical reviews. He explained that technical reviews are examinations of reports that the DOE submits to the NRC and an observation is a trip the NRC makes out to SRS to see what physical actions are going on at the site and seeing how those physical actions are going to impact Progress Reports and Waste Determinations.

CAB Chair Bettencourt asked if a Class C waste is an NRC yardstick and not a DOE yardstick. Mr. Suber said this was true and CAB Chair Bettencourt asked how that compares with what one usually thinks about, in DOE terms, TRU waste and high level waste; he asked where Class C waste fits in. Mr. Suber answered that DOE has greater than Class C waste and there's a ceiling on the concentration levels for Class C waste. He continued that if the radionuclide concentrations are above what the NRC calls Class C limits, the NRC calls it "greater than Class C waste." Mr. Suber explained that it is a type of commercial designation based on the concentration rate of the radionuclide and that high-level waste is kind of a catchall because it is based on the source of the waste, not the concentration. He continued that he believes one of the reasons behind the NDAA legislation was there are conflicting meanings that don't really speak to each other out there, and the 3116 legislation was trying to try to add some reason. He added that 3116 is asking, "What's the risk with this waste?" and allows DOE, in consultation with the NRC, to take the waste, look at it from a risk perspective and figure out what the logical way to dispose of the waste is.

He said that with Saltstone, the NRC is in its monitoring phase and in this phase the NRC does observations at the site and analyze technical reviews. He continued that in 2010, the NRC has already conducted two onsite observations; one in February 2010 and the other in April 2010. He added that there was a third onsite observation to be conducted on July 28. He explained that every year the NRC comes up with an annual monitoring report and in that report has the conclusions of the onsite observations in addition to an evaluation of all the technical reviews done that year. The annual monitoring report for 2009 will be out in a few weeks and the report for 2010 will be out by April 2011. He commented that the 2010 report is late due to resource restraints.

CAB Chair Bettencourt asked if the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), or 3116, allows salt and Saltstone to be considered low-level waste since everything that comes out of a tank is considered high-level waste according to the act. Mr. Suber said that was correct. As a result, that waste can be determined to be low level and would be suitable for near surface exposure. Ms. Jeanette Hyatt commented that the Nuclear Waste Policy Act is a source-based definition and so it says everything in a tank farm is high level waste. She summarized that it's the process of saying "that's clean enough."

CAB member Hayes asked for more information on the term "clean enough," and for clarification on what the yardstick is for determining if it's clean enough.

Mr. Suber answered that he is not exactly sure and explained there is an evaluation the NRC does where it looks at the technology used, makes sure the best available technology is used, and assess what was in the tank initially, what is being left behind, and whether that volume of waste has been moved to the maximum extent possible. CAB member Hayes said that Mr. Suber's question didn't answer her question and asked if

there is someone who could. Ginger Dickert responded to CAB member Hayes by stating when she gives her presentation, she is going to talk about NDAA, or 3116, and asked if the questions on the subject could be held until then.

He continued that the NRC has issued a Request For Additional Information (RAI) on the revised Performance Assessment in April 2010. He explained that the DOE has responded to the RAI and are currently reviewing them. He continued that the NRC believes it will complete the review by November 2010.

Mr. Suber stated that for F-Tank Farm, they are still in the consultation phase and the NRC has held an F-Tank Farm public meeting. Earlier in the year it also held a public meeting on H-Tank Farm. He explained that the reason the NRC is concerned about H-Tank Farm is that H-Tank Farm has tanks that are actually in the ground water and F-Tank Farm was above ground water. He stated that the NRC intends to continue interaction with the CAB and look for ways to make sure that the CAB sees the NRC as a source of information.

CAB member Domby commented that he noticed on one of Mr. Suber's presentation slides that the NRC received the DOE's revised Performance Assessment in May but analysis and review of it is not going to start until September; he asked why there is such a delay. He then commented that if Saltstone process is delayed, it will basically slow up all the other activities and they need those large volumes. Mr. Suber answered that the reason for the delay is that it was the revised performance assessment and that the NRC has financial and personnel constraints. He said that the NRC plans to review the revised Performance Assessment and Waste Determination, simultaneously. CAB member Domby commented that he understands that the NRC has constraints, and stated that Mr. Suber commented that the NRC has had change of personnel and lack of continuity. He asked how the NRC is assuring that for this project there's knowledge transfer, particularly reasonable assurance.

Mr. Suber said that most of the changes have occurred within the project management staff and most of the core technical people have stayed the same and add to the continuity. He continued that it is unlikely that the NRC is going to forget what it calls reasonable assurance. Nishka Devaser, NRC, commented that the staff documents as much of what is going on in monitoring or in consultation as it can. He continued that the annual monitoring report keeps a good measurement of the assurances made.

Ms. Wilson, SCDHEC, noted that Section 3116 requires NRC monitoring to be done in coordination with the state of South Carolina and so every time there is an observation visit or monitoring, there is some coordination. She continued that past observation visits when SCDHEC was aware, it had SCDHEC engineers and scientists out there with the NRC. She stated that she just wanted everyone to be aware that there is state involvement in observations as well as NRC.

CAB member Greene-McLeod asked of the problem with Technetium had to do with depleted uranium oxide or is it some other issue. Mr. Suber replied that he is not familiar with that, but he thinks it is a different issue.

Presentation: Tank Closure: Regulatory Framework- Ginger Dickert, Savannah River Remediation (SRR)

Ms. Dickert stated that her intent is to give the CAB an overview of tank closures so the CAB can understand what its opportunities for involvement are. She said she was going to address what is F-Tank Farm, what does all the documentation cover, what's the framework and where the Closure and Waste Disposal Authority is today.

She explained that F-Tank Farm is located in the center of the Site [and referred to a map to show the general separations area.] She explained that within that tank farm, there are three types of tanks: type 1, type 4, type 3 and 3A. She added that they focus on the tanks but there are other structures in the tank farm that are also involved in the closure process.

Ms. Dickert explained to the Regulatory Documentation Path handout and said that all of it gets followed by the full CERCLA closure of the entire F-Tank Farm in F Area.

She then broke down the chart into items listed, starting with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). She explained that NEPA sets forth requirements to evaluate options, the impact of those options, as to what these activities will cause to happen or what impact it will have on the environment. She added that there is a previously prepared Environmental Impact Statement for tank closure, issued on May 2002 and a Record of Decision (ROD) that went along with that, in August 2002. She stated that a Supplement Analysis to that previous Environmental Impact Statement has been drafted to recognize the change and process, such as the 3116 process, and the different set of criteria. It analyzes how this new information fits in with the old Environmental Impact Statement and will be ready for issuance as soon as the F-Tank Farm Performance Assessment is approved. She then continued to explain the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) 3116 gives process by which they can say that material that was previously high level waste, which resulted from the reprocessing of spent fuel, has now been decontaminated sufficiently or removed to the point at which the residual can be managed as low level waste. She referenced Mr. Suber's presentation on Saltstone. She added that in reference to tank closure, it means they have removed enough waste in the tank so where the residual that remains within the tank can be managed as low level waste. She explained this is what 3116 does; it doesn't look at any other requirements and it is very specific to the radionuclides. She then listed the criteria for NDAA 3116. She summarized these as: (1) it doesn't require permanent isolation in a deep geologic repository, and (2) had highly radioactive radionuclides removed to the maximum extent practical. She added that a great deal of evaluation goes into the second criteria. She explained that they have to show they evaluated all available technologies, have appropriately selected the correct technologies, have appropriately deployed and executed those technologies, used them to the point where they can practically remove anything, and what is left is protective of human health and the environment. She clarified that there is no number or threshold for removal; they remove the most that is practical.

She stated that there is other criterion that relates to the Performance Assessment. She explained that there is a provision that states "does not exceed concentration limits for Class C low-level waste," but there is also a provision in the legislation if they wanted to exceed Class C concentration limits. She added that DOE, at this time, does not contemplate leaving greater than Class C materials in tanks, and therefore, it is working under part A of 3116. She noted that part A requires as part of its criteria that the maximum dose for any hypothetical individual, for the next 10,000 years, could receive as the result of the closures of the tanks would be 25 millirem. She clarified that this would be a maximally exposed individual. To put 25 millirem into perspective, she explained that citizens of South Carolina receive 620 millirem a year just from cosmic radiation and medical x-rays, citizens in Denver can expect about 40 more because of the altitude, citizens traveling across the country and back will get 5 millirem, and citizens that travel to Europe and back can expect 10 millirem. She concluded that setting the maximum to 25 millirem is setting a very conservative threshold and is protective of human health and the environment.

She continued that DOE order 0 435.1 is the requirements the DOE establishes for the ongoing operations of its radiological facilities, as well as its own Implementation Guide. She continued that under those there are a number of documents that are prepared such as the Composite Analysis, a Tier 1 Closure Plan, a Special Analysis and a Tier 2 Authorization, which is a final authorization.

She stated that the Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) is an agreement among the DOE, SCDHEC, and the EPA; it outlines schedule commitments and the framework in which those three agencies are going to work toward the closure. The FFA recognizes that the state of South Carolina will regulate the facilities pursuant to the South Carolina Pollution Control Act under Industrial Waste Water Permitting. She added that the Closure Module provides tank system-specific closure information and demonstrates compliance with the FFA and South Carolina's Pollution Control Act requirements; this is the final document that South Carolina approves to show satisfaction and authorization.

Ms. Dickert continued that "feeding" all of those is the Performance Assessment, which is a highly important and technical document; she called it a "key" reference document that informs all other

documents and allows decisions to be made. It proves the best estimation of what the consequences will be over time and utilizes informed assumptions.

Presentation: Nuclear Regulatory Commission Meeting Synopsis- Sherri Ross, Savannah River Remediation

Ms. Ross summarized a public meeting the DOE and NRC held on July 13-14. The meeting was in support of the development of the Waste Determination Basis Document, and added they are on schedule to publish the document on September 30, 2010. The purpose of the meeting was to have technical discussions between the SRS staff and technical representatives. She said they wanted to get their input on DOE's proposed approach to comply with the NDAA criteria.

To support the meeting, Ms. Ross said SRR developed seven input packages and provided these packages to the NRC 30 days prior to the meeting. She added that both the NRC and DOE posted these input packages on their websites for public availability and copies were available at the meeting. Furthermore, the NRC and DOE announced it as going to hold this public meeting on its website, and invited the CAB's Waste Management Committee, as well as invitations to South Carolina representatives and the EPA. She said they also issued an Environmental Bulletin in order to expand notifications to the public and there were more than 12 people at the meeting, which was held at the Aiken Municipal Building. The public could attend in person or by web cast.

She added that towards the end of the meeting there was a discussion on a Path Forward, pertaining to the status of the overall consultation process between the DOE and NRC. She said the NRC has provided feedback to DOE and DOE is very pleased with the response and minimized impacts to its schedule. Discussion between the DOE and NRC will be put on both agencies' websites.

She commented that the CAB asked for laymen terms on the Waste Determination document and said that DOE would provide that information or present it to the CAB.

CAB member Parson thanked SRR for the graph Ms. Dickert used in her presentation and asked if the CAB could get it in large map/poster form so to use it as a resource. Ms. Dickert agreed to provide the CAB with a poster of the graph.

CAB member Jayaraman said he was lucky to go to the public NRC meeting and got excellent answers to the questions he asked. He commented that he would like the CAB to reread and rethink pages 8 and 10 of the Ms. Dickert's presentation document.

CAB member Bridges asked where the Performance Assessment stands. Ms. Ross answered that Rev 0 of the Performance Assessment was issued in 2008, Rev 1 was issued in April of 2010, and it is under review and they've received comments from SCDHEC and EPA. NRC will review it in conjunction with the Waste Determination Document, starting in December. She continued that the Performance Assessment is done, is out for review and comments, and was provided to the Waste Management Committee in April. CAB member Bridges asked if the Rev 1 will be the last Rev. Ms. Ross said no and explained that the Performance Assessment is a living document and it assesses the potential risks associated with closing F-Tank Farm. She added that they will issue it for public viewing each time it is updated, but for now, they believe that Rev 1 is enough information. CAB member Bridges commented to Ms. Dickert that he believes that by talking about the "floating limit" or "maximum extent practical," she opens herself up to ratcheting and back-fitting when someone has a new idea. She said they were sensitive to that.

CAB member Ortaldo thanked Ms. Dickert and Ms. Ross for their presentations. He commented that everyone can see from the presentations that the issue is very complicated and takes a good deal of effort. He said that everyone is trying to do it right, the CAB would like to see it done faster, but it takes time. He noted that everyone can see the involvement by all four agencies and that there are many checks and balances. He reminded the CAB that there are many opportunities for input and said that if they don't do it, it's their own faults. He asked the CAB to let him know if it wanted to hear anything more on the subject and said if it does, he will arrange a presentation during the Waste Management Committee.

Public Comments~

Ms. Karen Patterson addressed the NRC, thanking Mr. Devaser and Mr. Suber for their willingness to participate in the process. She said that she believes the more people who are involved in the decisions, the better the decisions will be. She also thanked Ms. Ross for the web cast; she said it is a great idea and how she was able to participate in the last public meeting.

She said she wanted to express a public perspective in the NRC's role in the tank closure. She continued that she doesn't believe that the authors of 3116 ever envisioned that it would take several NRC careers to get through this. She stated that in reference to some of the issues brought up, she couldn't see how those issues would inform NRC's decision. She stated "As a tax payer who's paying for this twice, as in paying for the DOE to provide the NRC the information and paying the NRC to review the information, I would really like the NRC to step back and before it issues the REIs in December, make sure that the information the NRC is requesting in the REIs is actually going to give the NRC information it needs to make a better decision than it can make right now."

She explained that since listening to some of the information at the public meeting, she is not sure that all the things NRC is asking for is going to improve its decision.

Lunch~

Strategic and Legacy Management Committee- Dr. Jerry Wadley, Chair

The committee Chair introduced his Vice Chairs, Madeleine Marshall and Marolyn Parson. He stated that the committee has pending recommendations including 262, on future missions, which was adapted in May 2009. He said that CAB member Marshall is working on that Recommendation and that it will probably be wrapped up in the next committee meeting. He added that Recommendation 272, which is to increase SRS public tours, is also pending and a letter response from DOE was received on the issue. The letter stated that SRS will increase the number of public tours from 23 to 30 in 2011; he said it didn't know if that would be enough and said they would take it up in committee.

He stated that the day prior they discussed some performance measures and the CAB wants to get from the DOE a presentation or a graphic presentation. He added that after that meeting, Rich Olsen approached him and said they were already working on that and they were listening to the CAB comments on the last two presentations and that he will be making a presentation at the next committee meeting. He said after that presentation, the committee will make its determination on whether they need to make another recommendation. He stated that the next meeting is scheduled for August 18 in Aiken.

Presentation: Energy Park Initiative- Karen Guevara, DOE-SR

Ms. Guevara stated that the topic of an energy park at SRS has been something that got launched as an ancillary concept to the footprint reduction initiative that is under the ARRA. She continued that she would speak about what the EM clean-up mission is, how it meshes with an energy park and what the existing policies are within DOE that allow it to contemplate an energy park. She added that she will also speak briefly about stakeholders, such as who is pushing the park forward, concerns and varied opinions, the foundation of talking through an energy park concept and where the Site is now in its progress. She addressed to the CAB that her presentation would not be a presentation where she is telling them what the DOE is going to do, but rather a preparation for the kind of conversation that happens in respect to energy parks.

She explained that one of the very first questions DOE gets is, "How does this fit within our existing missions?" She answered that DOE and SRS is funded through the Environmental Management (EM) Program and its mission is clean-up and footprint reduction. She explained that EM also provides infrastructure support to all Site missions and accelerated clean-up will make areas available for other uses. She stated that they clearly have infrastructure that can be used for other missions.

She continued that DOE has a well-established process for land transfer, but lacks anything that explicitly says that lands that were once withdrawn for purposes of weapons production activities can now morph into future land use of developing an energy park. She added that at SRS, DOE does not currently lease any land of facilities for energy research or production. She continued they don't have an energy parks policy, but they have some working language in the authorization bills of both the House and Senate.

CAB member Bridges asked if there was any real drive in DOE or is it a Congress-driven initiative. Ms. Guevara answered that DOE has not been the one pushing the legislation, and in fact, Energy Communities Alliance is one of the key entities that have pushed. She added that the Environmental Management Advisory Board has similarly recommended that EM Sites look at the physical assets and figure out what might be useful for purposes of developing an energy park. CAB member Burke asked if this energy park initiative was included in the Energy Act that the House Representatives passed last year. Ms. Guevara answered it is not part of that Act. Ms. Guevara continued that there is also the Secretary of Energy who is making explicit statements with respect to renewable energies and stated that DOE's strategic plan speaks to the need to gain energy independence.

CAB member Jayaraman asked for an explanation on what is meant by an "energy park." He asked if it is just in terms to installation. Ms. Guevara said that the concept of an energy park essentially comes down to looking at existing assets of SRS and determining whether they are either renewable energy types of applications or nuclear applications and whether there are ways to build on existing capabilities of SRS to support either research activities with respect to energy production, energy production itself or manufacturing improvements.

She continued that the Secretary of Energy has talked about energy independence for the DOE as key goals. This includes renewable energy, and nuclear energy policies, and so the energy park initiative is opening the door. She added there are no proposals as of yet, but the Secretary is postulating on a number of issues that could fit into the energy park initiative.

CAB member Hayes asked why the Yucca Mountain repository is still on the list. Ms. Guevara said it is on there because the policy of the Secretary of Energy is to cancel the Yucca Mountain repository it does raise the question as to whether there are other alternatives. She said that slide notes that the Secretary has cancelled the Yucca Mountain repository, has a Blue Ribbon Panel involved, and whatever the Blue Ribbon Panel comes up with could conceivably fit into an energy park concept. CAB member Hayes responded that science and engineering has done its job, but DOE has yet to do its own job. Ms. Guevara said that her presentation is not stating that the DOE has answers in respect to the Yucca Mountain repository and the Blue Ribbon Panel; it is addressing that because there is uncertainty in those processes now, it's conceivable that there is mission work SRS could do that would come out of either the decision to cancel the Yucca Mountain repository or the Blue Ribbon Panel recommendations. She added that in terms of time, an energy park could take decades.

CAB member Hayes asked if there was any information on the concept of advanced reactors. She asked if the technology is still on the drawing board or is there something substantial that could be shared. Ms. Guevara answered that she knows there are some modular concepts that are being proposed and private industry has the lead on many of those at the moment. She continued that the Office of Nuclear Energy within the DOE funds some of those possibilities. CAB chair Bettencourt commented that this issue is bigger than SRS and his intent is to discuss it on Thursday at the teleconference with the other SSAB Chairs to see if it is a subject that might lead to a SSAB Chairs letter to the EM. Ms. Guevara said this goes farther than an EM issue and is a DOE issue.

Ms. Guevara explained that there have been two public meetings on the concepts energy parks. She stated that there is no DOE-wide policy or direction from the Secretarial level, but they do have national energy policies, and consider carbon footprint reduction and the role of nuclear power in the energy mix as possibilities that may inform a future energy park concept. She added that energy park development can be guided by existing facilities and locations, and existing facilities could serve as the core of an SRS energy park. Examples of these existing facilities include Three Rivers Landfill, Biomass Cogeneration Facilities, and the Hydrogen Center of Excellence.

Ms. Guevara stated that the initial conclusions are that DOE thinks it is consistent with its processes but it lacks specific policy and DOE thinks that the land transferred under the 770 process can be leased but that DOE still maintain that ownership. In terms of funding, DOE thinks that it would be looking to see what type of private financing might be available. She then asked if there were any questions from the CAB.

CAB member Wadley commented that during the presentation in April, there was a slide showing the physical facilities associated with the Biomass Cogeneration Facility to use the excess CO₂. He said it showed on and offsite facilities that may be built. He asked if that was one of Ms. Guevara's slides. Ms. Guevara answered that she included that in her presentation at the last public meeting and that it is a depiction of SRNS Energy Freedom Center's idea of possibilities. CAB member Wadley commented that he knows it was just a possibility, but that it opened up other possibilities and asked if the slide could be shown at a future meeting. Ms. Guevara agreed.

CAB member John Snedeker asked if there have been any consultations or outreach with the industries that could conceivably view this as an opportunity to create a new facility or relocate facilities that already exist. Ms. Guevara said there have been a number of those types of conversations, but not at SRS. She said that many of those corporate interests are raised at the DOE Headquarters level and are not raised to the EM clean-up program but rather to nuclear energy or some of the renewable energy programs. She concluded there is interest but DOE and SRS are not focused on pulling in that level of interest from corporate.

CAB member Alex Williams commented that the energy park concept would have a great impact on County employment and tax base and asked as for the use of the land, how does this merge with the "invasion" of the Army at SRS. Ms. Guevara answered that they've talked with the Army and the energy park concept will trump whatever the Army is doing. She added they are writing the MOUs to ensure the Army does not have the trump vote.

CAB member Bridges asked if DOE or in Headquarters have an interest in plain, existing state-of-the-art reactors, put together to meet a need that would serve a need centered around SRS. He asked if that concept is being developed or if anyone in Headquarters have any interest in anything less than a highly advanced concept; he called them "pedestrian reactors." Ms. Guevara answered that Plant Vogtle is planning two more reactors and there is the question of "Do we really need some 'pedestrian' reactors at SRS given that there are two new reactors across the river?" She said she doesn't think that it is reviewed as particularly likely.

Presentation: Superfund Job Training Initiative- Rachel Hall

Ms. Hall stated that the Superfund Job Training Initiative (Super JTI) is funded by the Technical Assistance to Support Communities Contract (TASC), which is an EPA headquarters contract. Ms. Hall said they were really excited to bring to Region 4, to SRS, this collaborative process that fosters worker-ready programs. She continued that SRS is the first federal facility to receive this program and the first cycle completed in August of 2009 employed 16 people. She stated that the objective of the program is to support underserved, under-employed, and unemployed individuals and to support communities that are socio-economically challenged. She explained that the process involved five phases.

Phase One consisted of establishing a core team, of DOE and EPA partners, as well as community partners; they also have to form a relationship with contractors in order to find out which jobs are available so to form an appropriate training program.

Phase Two consists of outreach, public relations, and educating the surrounding communities about the job training.

Phase Three consists of candidate assessments, including academic, professional and person background checks. She said they also review SRS required documentation, conduct drug screenings and take community recommendations.

Phase Four involves the rigorous process of selecting the candidates. The candidates are then trained, graduated, interviewed by the contractor who was offering the job. They follow up with the candidates for a year after being placed in order to ensure all goes well.

She stated that cycle one had many community partners including SRS, Parsons, and The Imani Group. Cycle one was initiated in December 2008 and resulted in 350 interested candidates. She added that SRNS was the EPA's partner and it offered 21 job opportunities to the program. She stated that 90 candidates were selected to tryout and went through a rigorous process; in August of 2009, 16 were employed as materials handlers and production operators at SRNS.

CAB member Bridges asked what the big discriminator was in the drop of candidates from 179 to 43. Ms. Hall answered that they hated to cut candidates, but were offered 43 jobs from SRR and that was the target to fill.

She continued by showing the candidate profiles and stated that 11 candidates already possessed degrees in communications, electrical engineering, criminal justice and biology. She explained that more than 50 percent of the selected candidates were from Aiken County, 21 percent were from Barnwell and 12 percent were from Allendale.

She stated that the pre-employment job skills training (PEJST) lasted two weeks in May and classes were held on topics such as cultural competency, SRS culture, resume building, interview skills, dress-for-success, environmental justice, financial and nutrition awareness. Parsons conducted individual mock interviews. She stated that the point of these two weeks was the transformation and maturation of the candidates.

Ms. Hall explained that SRR committed to 43 positions as Radiological Control Inspectors, as well as Mechanical and Electrical Maintenance Operators. The position of Radiological Control Inspector required a degree, so the 11 candidates that had college degrees were selected to transition to a fast-track technical training program. The remaining 31 candidates were administered exams after they completed their technical training and 15 began their careers as General Production Operators, seven as Radiological Control Auxiliary and six as Temporary Materials Handlers. She added that the Temporary Materials Handlers will be able to train for a higher position if they can increase their test scores.

As she concluded, she highlighted the differences and comparisons in Cycle 1 and Cycle 2, such as different hiring contractors, where the program was based, the number of candidates selected, lessons learned in reference to background checks, the hosting college, and technical training. She added that both cycles cost roughly \$ 200,000.

CAB member Bridges asked that during the pre-employment stage, what kind of wage would a trainee be given. Ms. Hall said the trainees were not paid during that period.

CAB member Jayaraman showed concern with calling the 6-week training "technical training," and suggested it be called "vocational training." He asked if the students learned or were just taught. CAB member Harley-Fitts said the program was well worth it, and needed, and commented to CAB member Jayaraman that what made the students learn is that they were unemployed and would do what they had to do to succeed. She said the students put their heart into it because times are so difficult, and she commends those who stepped up and put on the program.

CAB member Williams commented that for the CAB, CAB member Harley-Fitts was the "mover and the shaker." He said they had the first planning session at her headquarters in Allendale, and said she was a hard worker and motivator. He added that how the students learn is that the training is tailored to the job.

Ms. Hall said they are looking for a third cycle in Augusta and are currently evaluating it.

Break ~

Nuclear Materials Committee- Stan Howard, Vice Chair

CAB member Howard substituted for CAB member Greene-McLeod. He briefly stated what the committee is concerned with and listed a few topics that are often covered.

He announced that the next Nuclear Materials Committee meeting would be on August 24, in the new meeting center in Aiken, at 5:30 p.m. He requested that the CAB take some time, notably with CAB member Wadley, to discuss Rose's earlier comment about the Yucca Mountain lack of activities because the issue could impact nuclear materials disposition.

He commented that his committee has three open recommendations and they have received a response to Recommendation 271, which was on finalizing a plan for plutonium disposition. He continued by stating that it deals with the change of plans and notice of intent for a SEIS to be discussed in the next few months. He added that Pat McGuire gave him some information on the notice of intent to modify the scope of the surplus plutonium disposition Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. He said there will be public meetings at several locations; August 3 will be in Tanner, AL; August 5 in Chattanooga, TN; August 17 in North Augusta, SC; August 24 in Carlsbad, NM; and August 26 in Santa Fe.

CAB member Howard stated that they closed Recommendation 250; Recommendations 259, 266 and 263 are still open.

Presentation: Nuclear Materials Dispositions Accomplishments- Allen Gunter, DOE-SR

Mr. Gunter introduced himself as the Senior Technical Advisor to the Assistant Manager for the Nuclear Materials Stabilization Program. He said he would review the accomplishments seen this fiscal year thus far and future plans.

He stated there is a surveillance program that is monitored to ensure the safe storage of plutonium at SRS. He noted that they are scheduled to do 34 nondestructive examinations; these are examinations where they do radiographs, look for pressurization, perform smears to make sure there are no leaks, and account for the material. He added that they have done 33 of the 34 nondestructive examinations and have seen no issues. He commented that they have performed 16 of the 18 destructive examinations and these examinations are when they cut the cans open, retrieve the gas inside, take samples of the material, and take the tops of the cans to run them through tests; the other two tests will be done before the end of the fiscal year and of the tests performed so far, no issues have been found. He explained that they're not only looking at the condition it's in today, but also at if it was that same condition for a 50-year period, what it would look like in 50 years; he said there is nothing that appears as a challenge to the containers at this point.

He continued by stating that they are also processing plutonium and dissolving it today. He referred to a slide that showed an example of an inter-matching with an EIS and said they plan to process approximately 400 kilograms through 2012. He said they did 66 kilograms this year. He added that they did have some equipment problems such as failed dissolvers in H area. He said that the plutonium solution will be sent to the liquid waste system incorporated into the high-level waste glass. He reiterated they are staying within the 897 limit at this time.

CAB Chair Bettencourt commented that it seems that the Notice of Intent carries a NNSA and asked what the implications were. Mr. Gunter answered that this is a joint SEIS and the original EIS is a NNSA EIS. He explained that they joined the two because some of the things in the EIS deal with the NNSA program and non-pit plutonium material that is not suitable for Mox. He continued that on the SEIS there is going to be an "aggressive schedule," and they are hoping that by the end of the next fiscal year, which is September of 2011, they will be able to issue a Record of Decision (ROD).

He then switched topics to discuss the Unirradiated Program in H Canyon and said they separate H Canyon processing. He referred to a slide of an unirradiated HU he said they've been working on for a few years; they're completing the dissolution of that 5.6 metric ton of unirradiated HEU and hope to have it by mid-September. He added they've done 600 kilograms this year and as a result, they've shipped out

approximately 18 metric tons of low enriched uranium to the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) Facility. They plan to ship an additional 3 metric tons of blended material by the end of the fiscal year. He commented that they are also making plans to begin processing the spent nuclear fuel in H Canyon in September 2010; he explained that they are waiting for approval of the Amended Record of Decision by the Assistant Secretary of Environmental Management.

CAB member Bridges asked why it is an Amended Record of Decision. Mr. Gunter stated that the original ROD was meant for a different project, so they are revising the ROD to processing in H Canyon.

He continued by stating that the spent nuclear fuel program has been very active in making preparations to support shipments of spent fuel from L Area over to H Canyon at the end of the year. He added that this year has been the first year they have received material under the GAP program that is not U.S. origin material; they received these shipments from Chile. In addition to that, he stated that they have received 13 casks this year under the “normal” foreign reactor program and from the domestic research reactor program, they’ve received 14. He listed examples of the domestic research as material from Hyphar at Oakridge, M.I.T., University of Missouri, and the National Institute of Standards.

He said there has been a good deal of discussion on infrastructure upgrades so to keep the Canyon facilities in an operational condition. He explained that to ship from L Area to H area, they have to ship in a 70 ton cask; there are five of them that have been used over the years at SRS. He stated that when they looked at them in preparation for the program, they noticed some upgrades that needed to be done, and two have been upgraded thus far. In K Area a couple of leaking roofs were replaced and parking lots were resurfaced.

He referred to the Documented Safety Analysis (DSA) and stated that a few years back the GAO had a look at the facility and talked about the DSA. The former DSA was not lacking in analysis, but it was not in the format used for a facility that will be operating in the long term. This DSA has been updated, and approved, and is now being incorporated and this should allow the CAB to close its recommendation.

CAB Chair Bettencourt asked if the only thing wrong with the DSA was the format, why it is being implemented. Mr. Gunter answered that in the past they were processing unirradiated material and now they are processing spent fuel so they have to change things within procedures and facilities. He added that some of the analysis was updated as well.

CAB member Hayes asked that on the difference between the U235 and the U238, what was the U235 unirradiated utilized for to begin with. Mr. Gunter answered that most of it came from the NNSA sites and was material they were doing experiments with and retired weapon components.

CAB member Wadley asked what TVA will do with the 18 metric tons of material sent to it. Mr. Gunter answered that TVA makes it into fuel.

CAB member Domby commented, in reference to the Notice of Intent for plutonium disposition SEIS, that one of the things that surprised the CAB was there is not a preferred alternative and asked Mr. Gunter to talk about that. Mr. Gunter said that the numbers in the SEIS are a little different than the numbers the CAB is used to hearing about, but it’s a NEPA document and such as in the past, when NEPA documents are written it’s written for more and is a bounding document. Therefore, over the years in different documents, more has been placed in those documents than what would normally be there.

CAB member Ortaldo commented that with all the options in the EIS, has DOE got what the schedule is for each of these options and how all of those different schedules would impact existing measures. He asked if they knew all the numbers and if they were part of the EIS and being taken into consideration. He said his biggest concern is that time is running out. Mr. Gunter answered yes, they have all that information and he agrees on the time and added that all of that is part of the analysis.

CAB member Bridges asked, in reference to the HEU, if they are sure they purged the system of all spec issues so that nothing else is coming. Mr. Gunter answered that more is coming and said that the reason they concentrated on doing the HEU is because they were able to change the piping in the Canyon to send

the waste to low-level waste, not high-level waste, so the high-level waste system gained tank space. He continued that once they start processing spent fuel they have to turn it back and start sending waste over Tank 39. He said there is a little bit of waste in certain areas, but it's not significant, and they can process it with the rest of the spent fuel.

CAB member Williams asked if there has been any consideration, if in a "real crunch," to dumping the little bit left over in the old burial grounds. Mr. Gunter said he would have to do some type of down-blending because safeguards and security would not allow him to bury high quality material there.

He then summarized his presentation by stating they have demonstrated they can safely store and disposition plutonium and iron-enriched uranium, they're planning to initiate processing by the end of the fiscal year, and they are supporting the nonproliferation by receipt of the highly enriched uranium and spent nuclear fuels.

CAB member Hayes asked how it has been demonstrated that they can safely store and disposition plutonium and iron-enriched uranium. She also asked that when they say "safely store," is there a time period involved. Mr. Gunter said to go back to the program they are running in K Area where they have material stored in 3013s, which have long-time storage and a life of up to 50 years. He said these are the ones they are taking out and doing the nondestructive examinations on; they are looking at what affects the gas, what affects the materials, pressurization and the corroding of inner containers. He added that they don't see anything that will jeopardize that storage. He added that they are also safely dissolving plutonium in H Canyon, transferring it to the sludge batches, and they've been doing that for the last three to four years. He said there have been no issues.

CAB member Hayes said she is talking about the containerization in particular and asked how they would stand up to geologic catastrophes. Mr. Gunter said they evaluated all those and it is the most secure facility in the complex. He said in the event of a geologic catastrophe, the containers will not fall down, break, or anything else that would cause contamination.

CAB member Howard commented on the June 22 meeting and stated that CAB member Burke had a table concept that he presented for disposition of radioactive waste, byproducts and nuclear materials. He said there will be some continuing discussions on the concept in August, with a possible presentation to the CAB in September. CAB member Burke stated that he did a presentation on an idea of how to track waste material that was onsite, as well as how hazardous it was and the amount and disposition plans. It was presented to Pat McGuire and that Mr. McGuire is going to look into it and hopefully it will be ready for the September meeting. He added that presumably, they will be able to look at this document in future years and be able to tell what progress is being made and to make sure that SRS is not being turned into a long-term repository for waste materials.

CAB member Howard added that another issue that will be discussed is the change of plans within the decision part of handling enriched uranium and plutonium in the H Area.

Administrative Committee Report- Sarah Watson, Chair

CAB member Watson introduced herself as Chair of the Administrative Committee, stated that the Administrative Committee is responsible for membership replacement, compliance with and amendments to the Board's standard operating procedures, nominations, other elections of Board officers, and public outreach.

She stated that the Administrative Committee last held a meeting on July 26. She reminded the CAB that the membership campaign is in full swing and they are actively soliciting applications for memberships. She encouraged everyone to go through their network for suitable applicants.

She said the CAB will be getting new guidelines regarding the membership process and asked everyone to put their questions on hold. She explained that this new information would come directly from the DOE and Ms. Guevara would communicate the new information to the CAB.

CAB member Watson announced that new committee schedules were passed out and everyone should be aware of the meetings and encouraged everyone to attend. She added that if a CAB member cannot make a meeting, they should “tune in” to the e-meetings. She also stated that if a CAB member is unable to attend either the live or e-meeting, they should communicate their absence to the Chair of the committee or to the staff; this goes for executive and Full Board meetings, too. She stated that in regards to the online e-meetings, there will be a presentation at the next Board meeting and that Erica Williams, V3T, will show everyone how to use it.

She stated she understands there has been some discussion over the scheduling of the committees meetings and said they will continue with the current schedule through the end of the year. She explained that she understands that the scheduling makes it difficult for some people to attend, but they have planned the meetings as they are outlined for economic reasons and they will adhere to it; she added they will look at it again at the end of the year.

CAB member Watson said that if the CAB has not had a chance to review the spring newsletter, to look it over and prepare for the next issue. She stated that if anyone has any concerns or information they would like to include, contact the CAB support team.

She continued that the CAB Retreat has been scheduled for October 28-30 at Rose Hill Estates in Aiken. She said they were concerned about trying to communicate a great deal of information in a day and a half, so it was extended. She encouraged all members to think of some issues or concerns to be included on the agenda and get those topics to the staff. She added that there has been discussion and concerns about emeritus status and CAB membership. She said they will get some firm communication, hopefully in writing, on the subject of emeritus status. She stated that DOE specifically dictates guidelines and she said that the CAB does its best to adhere to them.

She said that the CAB will continue its efforts in fine tuning its presentation for the Speakers Bureau. She added that in a meeting the day before, they talked about more specific guidelines and added that she and CAB Chair Bettencourt will get together to formulate some other guidelines that will be communicated to the CAB to make sure they are in compliance. She stated that CAB member Domby will continue to fine tune his presentation. She continued that her committee, looking at the Speakers Bureau and opportunities, will also try to piggyback on the SRS tours and she will ask that Ms. Guevara and Ms. Craft will work out the permission and clearance for that effort.

She stated that the Mentor Program is going along well and that she hasn’t heard any concerns or any ill will. She said they are looking at either extending or expanding the Mentor Program and that they will have an opportunity to connect the mentor and the mentee at the orientation stage.

CAB member Hayes stated that CAB member Watson used the phrase “in compliance” when talking about presentations for the Speakers Bureau. She asked if there was some kind of guidelines the CAB members could look over. CAB member Watson answered that there isn’t anything in print at this point and when she says “compliance” she means they want to make sure that when speakers on behalf of the CAB go out, they are in compliance as far as what they’re saying. She said they want to make sure that the Speakers Bureau for the CAB is solely responsible for communicating the CAB’s objectives, responsibilities, and that it will be solely focused on the CAB.

CAB member Parson asked if the DOE guidelines relevant to CAB are different than the internal CAB processes. CAB member Watson said that when she uses the phrase DOE guidelines, she was speaking specifically of procedures as far as electing new members. CAB member Parson said that’s part of the CAB processes as well. CAB member Watson stated that it is and that there are some changes that are coming forth that she does not have knowledge of at this time. She said that once they are given to her, she will be better able to communicate them to the CAB.

Gerri Flemming, DOE-SR, stated that if she understands her correctly, CAB member Parson is asking if the internal guidelines and the DOE EM guidelines are different. Ms. Flemming said the answer is a mix of “yes” and “no”; it is different because the internal guidelines are supposed to be able to help the CAB members, especially the newer CAB members, to see how things are being done here in these meetings and

not all Boards will hold meetings at the same times or in the same ways. She said if they decided to make changes, the CAB's internal guidelines would change, but that it has little to do with the DOE Headquarters EM guidelines. She stated that the EM guidelines govern all the Site Specific Advisory Boards and those are the things that everyone must do. She concluded that they are different in a sense that they are offering more information, but at the same time are in compliance with the guidelines they get from Headquarters.

Public Comments~

Jeanette Hyatt, the environmental director for SRNS, announced an upcoming opportunity to see some of the safety practices that are employed at SRS. She stated that annually DOE holds an integrated safety management system conference and this year it is being hosted by SRS. It will be held Wednesday, September 15, from 4 p.m. to 9 p.m. is family night; it is free and will have live music and interactive games. She said it will be held at the Augusta Marriott, in the Convention Center.

CAB member Williams commented that the support team is doing better and said that he sees many upgrades. He commented on the sign-in process, the name tags, catering and lunch tickets.

Ms. Freeman thanked everyone and adjourned the meeting.